



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



39.

682.





*CHURCH DISCIPLINE AND NATIONAL EDUCATION.*

---

A

# CHARGE

DELIVERED TO THE

CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE

OF

LLANDAFF,

IN SEPTEMBER, MDCCCXXXIX,

BY

EDWARD, LORD BISHOP OF LLANDAFF.

---

*PUBLISHED AT THE REQUEST OF THE CLERGY.*

---

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. G. F. & J. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD,  
AND WATERLOO PLACE, PALL MALL.

1839.

688.

LONDON:  
GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,  
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.



## A C H A R G E,

&c.

---

REVEREND BRETHREN,

ALMOST every triennial address which I have hitherto delivered has begun with remarking upon the dangers and troubles in which the National Church was involved, and which often threatened either its entire overthrow as an Establishment incorporated with the State, or the loss of some of its dearest and most useful privileges. It is, however, with some satisfaction that I call to mind the tone of hope and even of confidence I have ventured constantly to maintain in the midst of these formidable convulsions. Founded on a rock as the visible Church of Christ we know to be, and secure of Divine protection against all the malice and all the subtlety of the adversary, I do not for a moment doubt, that while the branch of it here established continues true to its



profession, and presents a firm and united front in the warfare which the world will always wage against it, we shall ensure to ourselves a due share of that protection, and shall come out of the fiery trial purified and invigorated, and better qualified by the lessons of adversity to counteract those insidious causes of decay, which a season of long security almost always engenders within the bosom of the Church itself.

That those remedial measures which even three years ago seemed ripe for execution have not yet been matured, is a fact which I could not then have anticipated ; but which, however to be lamented as protracting a state of uneasiness and anxiety, has still a ground of consolation, when we reflect how much we have gained by the subsidence of angry and restless feelings in the upper classes, and by a manifest return to that sober estimate of the value of a Church Establishment, which has generally distinguished this country (except during one stormy interval) from the period of the Reformation to the present day. Under the influence of this moderation and good sense, characteristic of our nation, one may indulge the hope, that each year of delay will tend to improve the legislative measures relating to the Church which have been long promised.

The Act indeed which passed in the first session of the present reign, for abridging Pluralities and

restricting Non-residence, besides a consolidation of the former laws on these subjects, has given many new facilities, and has removed many of those technical obstacles which before existed to the correction of this class of abuses. I cannot, however, but regret the rigour with which *pluralities* have been prohibited, as if the thing were an evil in itself, and not (as it really is) one which is either a good or an evil according to the circumstances of each particular case. If all benefices were adequately endowed, or if their endowment bore a due relation to the respective duties, and to the labour and the qualifications requisite for their performance, it might be said with truth that each minister ought to be content with his own portion, and that to appropriate to one what was designed for many is unfair and injurious. In the popular declamations upon this subject with which we have been all made familiar, this seems to be assumed as an unquestionable fact. The truth however is, that the most laborious duties, those which require the greatest talent and experience, and which impose the most anxious and unremitting care and responsibility, are in general the worst paid; and that the cause of the Church would often be greatly benefited by a transfer of income from rich benefices with easy duty, to those arduous stations which call for the services of the most zealous and able ministers. As this alienation of the funds of one benefice to supply the wants of another cannot literally be effected, the best expedient for correct-

ing the anomaly was, permission for the duty in a country parish to be performed by one who though resident was not the legal incumbent, in order that the legal incumbent might be more usefully employed elsewhere. He might thus be rewarded for his exertions in some important and arduous charge, while the duties of his own benefice might be provided for by a minister equally qualified for it, or sometimes even better adapted to the population and circumstances of the place, however inferior in learning or in talent as a preacher: whereas, under the rigid rule now prescribed, a patron is often restrained from bestowing reward upon great merit and long service, because he cannot do so without removing the individual from the sphere of his peculiar usefulness.

Another restraint, plausible in theory, but often found injurious in practice, is the rigid confinement of clergymen each to his own benefice, when a permutation of duty would often be not only conducive to the happiness of each, but mutually beneficial to their respective parishes. To permit this interchange, even for a season, without control, would lead to numberless abuses; but if the circumstances were fairly stated to the authorities of the Diocese, to whom the character of the parties and the peculiarities of each case are best known, I am certain that great advantage would result from a discretion duly exercised in such matters,—an advantage

not only in point of happiness to individuals, but of spiritual as well as temporal benefit to the Church at large.

By the law as it now is, a Bishop, whose chief care it should be to place labourers in all parts of the vineyard best calculated for the work allotted to them, has his discretion, which ~~is~~ <sup>was</sup> limited enough before, still more restrained, and is unable to sanction arrangements which the interests of the people not less than the comfort of the Clergy often call for,—arrangements which, though the world may call them abuses because they are departures from a theoretical scheme, yet are in reality *correctives* in practice of the inconveniences which every general rule must involve, unless some such discretion be allowed. This is more especially true in a Church where the patronage is vested so largely, as it is with us, in the hands of laymen; whose nomination of a clerk to the most important cure cannot be resisted by the Bishop, except on the ground that he is absolutely disqualified *for any cure whatever*. Of my own Diocese I do not scruple to say, that next to nominating, which I have seldom an opportunity of doing, men *peculiarly qualified* for vacant places, (a duty which lay-patrons are too apt to overlook) my greatest satisfaction is derived from contemplating those cases, where I have been the means of rectifying by dispensation either the negligence of patrons or the accidents of life, and of thus infusing

the *spirit* of true discipline into the Church, instead of maintaining the deadness of the letter.

You will not, I know, regard me, when expressing these sentiments, as one who would make light of rules, or who would, without good reason and for the sake of furthering the end of all rules, sanction a departure from them. But I think the jealousy of power, which in this country leads us to provide by written laws, even in the minutest matters, instead of vesting discretion in the functionary who has to administer them, however salutary it may be in civil affairs, and for the sake of securing our political liberties may be a sacrifice not unworthy of its object, yet often is, I cannot conceal from my own mind, even in matters of Civil concern, a grievous sacrifice both of practical expediency and of substantial justice; and in Ecclesiastical affairs it operates perniciously against the sacred interests of the Church, making *them* subordinate to its temporal interests, and depriving its highest authorities of that paternal control, which its divine Founder, for the furtherance of the Gospel and the increase of His kingdom, lodged in their hands.

These reflections lead me to consider the other great legislative measure affecting the Church, which, since our last meeting, has been brought before Parliament, and after much discussion has received the sanction of the upper House—the Bill for more

effectually enforcing Church Discipline. That this measure, if it had passed into a law, would have been an improvement upon the existing state of things, I have no doubt. Yet I cannot regard it as a misfortune that it still remains an unfinished work ; for it raises the hope that when resumed it will receive some material amendments, and be freed from those objections which excited strong opposition even among the Clergy ; and these amendments are now more likely to be introduced, than if it had once been placed on our statute book as the law of the land.

That the Bill was framed without a due consideration of the nature of the Episcopal office in the primitive Church, I think cannot be denied. The extent of the Episcopal jurisdiction in the early ages, as well as the mode of its administration, may be matter of dispute ; but that a Bishop was recognized as the Censor and Controller of the Clergy in all that relates to moral conduct and the offices of the Church within his Diocese, cannot be questioned by any who admit (and who is there, acquainted with Ecclesiastical History, that does not admit) the establishment of this form of Church Government from the beginning. Any law therefore which entirely annulled this authority, and placed it in other hands, would be so far declaratory against the genuine character of the Church. The authority itself indeed, given by the Divine Founder, human laws cannot abrogate. It remains entire, whatever the rulers

of this world may say, or whatever the licentiousness of professed Christians may incline them to do. By them it was not given, and by them it cannot be taken away.

“ The breath of worldly men cannot depose  
The deputy elected by the Lord.”

But it surely is inconsistent for a State which takes the Church into alliance with it thus to undermine one of the vital parts of its constitution. It is a virtual renunciation of its essence, while it pretends to venerate and support its form.

It was therefore a material improvement which during its progress the Bill received, when a power was given to Bishops to hear and determine suits against spiritual persons without public proceedings, provided the defendant were willing to submit to their arbitration ; and when the Bishop was empowered, after hearing the cause, to prohibit the accused person, if he thought fit, from officiating or residing on his preferment, and to provide by sequestration for the due service of the Church.

In a great majority of cases I have no doubt that the Clergy would willingly have submitted to this tribunal. Every conscientious man, every one mindful of his Ordination vows, every one possessed of a just sense of the constitution of the Church of Christ, would not only submit, but would gladly embrace

the opportunity of having his conduct, as a Clergyman, investigated by his spiritual governor, instead of exposing both himself and the cause of the Church to the world at large in a public court. But the misfortune is, that this feeling would operate less powerfully in proportion to the defendant's real unworthiness. The worse the case the less effective would the proposed remedy be : and in the case of a hardened offender, lost to all sense of shame and regard for character, who should refuse the Bishop's arbitration, the power of suspending him even from ecclesiastical functions would be wholly taken away, unless the Bishop chose to appear himself as a suitor in the Court of Arches, content to bear all the risk and all the delay which the practice of that Court requires. Nor could the slightest interruption be given for months, perhaps for years, to the ministrations of such a person, whose conduct gave scandal to the whole neighbourhood, inflicted pain on every religious mind, and was destructive of all spiritual benefit within his own parish. That such instances are rare is no answer to the objection. We know they are rare, and to none are they more offensive, when they do occur, than to the body of Clergy themselves ; who would gladly see the means given of removing such men from the sacred office which they profane and disgrace. In this department more especially, "rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil." I verily believe, therefore, that the Clergy themselves desire to see the spiritual



jurisdiction over their own body placed in spiritual hands ; and if so, can the members of an Episcopal Church hesitate as to the proper persons in whom should be vested the exercise of that jurisdiction ?

It is, as I have often had occasion to observe, one of the inconveniences we suffer by an union of the Church with the State, that the legal rights of each Incumbent, even when opposed to the authorities of his Diocese, are guarded with the same jealous care which protects all other kinds of property. And thus, when the punishment of a Clergyman would affect his temporalities, the law interposes all the caution and all the formalities by which the secular rights of individuals are protected. Whenever therefore both spiritual and temporal interests are involved in the question, the former are too often made subordinate and subservient to the latter ; and no summary decision can be obtained, for fear of impairing that sacredness which Englishmen are taught to believe is inherent in a *freehold*. This is part of the price we pay for the advantage of being united with the State. The balance of advantage, I have no doubt, still preponderates in favour of religion. Yet it is surely allowable, and even incumbent on us, to lessen this inconvenience as far as we can, consistently with the spirit of our laws concerning the private rights of individuals.

I am desirous, therefore, of seeing a broad distinction recognized between *absolute* and *qualified* free-

holds. It is a fallacy to speak of Church Endowments under the former character. There are many incidents to the tenure of Church property which deprive it of the character of a *freehold* estate, in the ordinary acceptation of that term. It is rather of the nature of a *trust* than a freehold. It can only be enjoyed by persons who hold certain opinions, who are subjected to a special examination at the discretion of the Ordinary, and who are thought worthy, by their learning, ability, and moral character, of the appointment. It cannot long be kept vacant; and if a duly qualified person be not speedily named by the patron, the nomination belongs to the spiritual governors of the Church. The nomination is void, if it be made for money<sup>1</sup>. The appointment is liable to be forfeited by the misconduct of the holder, or by a change in his opinions on certain doctrines, or by non-residence, or by acceptance of another benefice. All these conditions take it out of the class of possessions called *freehold estates*, and render every argument drawn from that consideration inconclusive and inapplicable.

<sup>1</sup> Much error prevails as to the right of purchasing presentations to livings. The *right* of presenting may be purchased, but the *exercise of the right for money* is simoniacal. Hence, during a vacancy, the presentation cannot be sold; neither is it legal to buy the right of presenting a particular person. The *right*, whether of perpetual presentation, or of single presentation, must be conveyed absolutely and unconditionally, if conveyed at all.

Sacred as property may be, the purposes for which it is held are equally sacred. In the instance before us I may surely affirm that they are still *more sacred*. To sacrifice these purposes then to the security of the temporary holder of the property is preposterous. It is a solecism in theory, quite as revolting to our reason, as the practice is injurious to the spiritual welfare of the people.

But if, as is probable, the submission of these temporal interests to the Spiritual jurisdiction exercised in a summary way would be offensive to the legal profession, and, as far as lay patronage is concerned, would excite strong opposition in the country at large, let at least a compromise be made, which according to my own view of the case might easily be done, and which would be quite sufficient for the discipline of the Church. Let the Spiritual governor, in passing sentence on a delinquent Clergyman, interfere no farther with the temporalities than is requisite for the due performance of the Church service: let him provide for this object by sequestration, and leave the remainder, whatever be its amount, untouched, until a final sentence shall be pronounced, by a tribunal more competent to decide questions involving the rights of individuals. The Church would then await the issue, however distant it might be, without being in the mean time paralyzed as it were, and incapacitated in the performance of her most vital functions.

In venturing on these remarks, nothing is farther from my mind than to cast a reflection upon the administration of the laws by our Ecclesiastical courts, more especially by the Court of Arches. On the contrary, I believe that the praise usually bestowed upon the administration of justice in all the courts of law in this country, belongs at least in an equal degree to *them*. Of the distinguished individual who long presided over that Court, whose recent departure out of this life, full of years and honour, we of this diocese not only deplored as a public but as a private calamity, I need not here enlarge. In every quality that constitutes an able, upright, indefatigable judge, he shone conspicuous; and if I were to add that his loss has been adequately supplied by the appointment of one worthy to succeed him, the sentiment would I am sure be echoed from the bosoms of all who hear me.

Neither is it the conduct or the ability of the Judges alone of these Courts which is above all censure or cavil. The proceedings of the Courts themselves (although capable perhaps of improvement in detail), are I believe as pure, as sagacious, as conducive to the elucidation of the merits of the cases brought before them, and to a final sentence according to law and equity, as those of any tribunal, even the highest, in the kingdom. It is not with their authority in what is called *contentious jurisdiction* that I would wish to interfere. Of this in all mat-

ters of right between *man* and *man* I am by no means jealous; nor am I now at all inclined to animadvert upon their method of proceeding. It is in questions concerning *man* and his *Redeemer* that I would wish to see the authority of Christ's Visible Church to be maintained by the State—and the power of its Governors recognized to restrain evil doers who minister in His name, to purify His sanctuary, to preserve His doctrines from corruption, and to provide, as far as human authority can provide, that His sheep be duly fed.

Whenever a question of this kind arises, is it not grievous to be told that the Bishop has no power of himself to control the offender, or to suspend his ministrations, or to stay the mischief? that he must wait the slow process of courts, sitting only at intervals, overwhelmed often with business, accessible only through functionaries of their own—that the Bishop must apply to these Courts in the character of a Suitor—that he must wait his turn to be heard—that he must employ Counsel to plead—and incur all the expenses and be subject to all the formalities which individual suitors submit to in order to determine some disputed right, or to obtain redress of some private wrong inflicted on themselves. Is this the adoption of Christianity into the constitution of the realm? Is this the union of Church and State? Are Bishops held to be incapable of “judging the smallest matters”—compelled to drop the character of governor

and to assume that of plaintiff—under a tribunal of lay judges,—before an unworthy minister can be removed or even suspended from his office ?

I think then that the provision made for a private hearing before the Bishop with power of suspending the accused party from spiritual functions, if the interests of the Church should seem to him to require it, was a considerable improvement in the composition of this Bill. It was conceded after much anxious solicitation, and it certainly tended to procure my own acquiescence in the measure. But in the postponement of that measure I rejoice, because I hope, seeing how great a change has already taken place in the opinions of moderate men, how much their minds have been opened to the true character of the Church of Christ, after the timely check which was given by the prompt and able interference of one member of the Episcopal bench—because I say I entertain good hope that the improvement will be progressive—and in particular, that this private tribunal will be authorized to act, *without requiring the consent* of the accused person as a previous condition<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> The following clauses of the Bill contain the amendments to which I allude :

“ VII. And be it enacted, That before any Bishop or other Person shall institute any such Suit, such Bishop or other Person shall leave or cause to be left in the Registry of the Bishop of the Diocese within which the Spiritual Person intended to be proceeded against shall hold Preferment, or in case such Spiritual

Besides the obvious propriety of investing the Governor of a Diocese with some legal authority

Person shall hold Preferment within more than One Diocese, then of the Archbishop of the Province, or in case such Spiritual Person shall hold Preferment in both Provinces then of the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, or in case such Spiritual Person shall not hold any Preferment then of the Bishop of the Diocese within which he shall be inhabiting, a Statement in Writing, subscribed by such Bishop or other Person, of the Nature and Particulars of each and every Offence imputed to such Spiritual Person for which it is intended to institute such Suit, and of the Time and Place at which each and every such Offence or Offences is or are alleged to have been committed ; and the Registrar of such Bishop or Archbishop shall and he is hereby required forthwith to deliver or cause to be delivered a Copy of such Statement to such Spiritual Person, or shall leave or cause the same to be left at the usual Residence of such Spiritual Person."

" VIII. And be it enacted, That if any such Spiritual Person shall, within Fourteen Days from the Delivery to him of any such Statement as aforesaid, freely and voluntarily, by Writing under his Hand, undertake to abide by such sentence as the said Bishop or Archbishop may give, *it shall be lawful for the said Bishop or Archbishop, if he shall think fit, without public Proceedings, by a Sentence under his Hand and Seal, to prohibit such Spiritual Person from residing on or officiating within any Preferment which he may hold within the Diocese, or Province or Provinces, as the Case may be ; and all such Sentences shall be good and effectual in Law as if pronounced by the Judge of the Court of Arches or by the Judge of the Chancery Court of York after a Hearing according to the Provisions of this Act, and may be enforced by the like Means, and shall be final and conclusive, and there shall be no Appeal therefrom : Provided always, that in all Cases in which such Spiritual Person shall have given such Undertaking as aforesaid the Registrar of such Bishop or*

over his Clergy, there is, I must be permitted to say, something incongruous and offensive to one's feelings

Archbishop shall, within Ten Days after the giving of such Undertaking, deliver or cause to be delivered a Notice in Writing in the Form or to the Effect in the Schedule to this Act in that Behalf contained, to the Person desirous of instituting such Suit, and also a like Notice to each and every Bishop within whose Diocese the said Spiritual Person may hold Preferment, and also a like Notice to the Churchwardens of each and every Parish in which such Spiritual Person may hold Preferment : and the Bishop or Archbishop shall not in any such Case proceed to give Sentence until after the expiration of one Calendar Month from the Time of sending such last-mentioned Notices, nor in case the Parties or any of them to whom such Notice shall have been sent shall within the said Month enter into sufficient Security to the Satisfaction of the Bishop to institute and prosecute, and shall accordingly within One Calendar Month thereafter institute and in due Course of Law prosecute, a Suit against the said Spiritual Person for the said Offence or Offences in the Court of Arches or in the Chancery Court of *York*, as the Case may be ; in which Suit, and at any Stage thereof, it shall be lawful for the said Bishop to intervene, if he shall think fit : Provided also, that after a Sentence so given it shall not be competent to any Person to bring any Suit under this Act against such Spiritual Person on account of the Offence or Offences for which the said Sentence purports to have been given ; and such Offence or Offences, and the Undertaking aforesaid, shall be stated in the said Sentence, which shall be entered and remain on record in the Registry of the said Bishop or Archbishop.

IX. And be it enacted, That when any such Sentence of Prohibition shall have been given, the Bishop or Bishops shall sequester any such Preferment in the same Manner and for the same Purposes as are herein-after mentioned in Cases of Suspension by any Definitive Sentence or Decree of the Judge of the



in the employment of professional advocates upon occasions of this nature. According to the received opinion and general practice of this country (more, I believe, than of any other civilized country in the world) it is the duty of an advocate to aim at the success of his client, by all the means and all the arts which ingenuity and sophistry can devise—that he is to identify himself with his client, adopt all his feelings and wishes, extenuate what cannot be disproved, discredit the adverse testimony, take advantage of every technical flaw, and every slip, and every informality which the carelessness of the opponent may have committed, and protract the suit as far as the practice of the Court will permit, if the interests (and sometimes if the private wishes and desires) of

Court of Arches or of the Judge of the Chancery Court of *York* : Provided always, that the said Bishop may, if he shall see fit, in and by such Sentence assign to such Spiritual Person out of the Profits of such Preferment any annual Sum not exceeding One Half of the net annual Value of such Preferment.

X. Provided always, and be it enacted, That at any Time after the Expiration of Fourteen Days from the Delivery of such Statement aforesaid to such Spiritual Person, the Bishop or Archbishop by whose Registrar such Statement shall have been delivered or caused to have been delivered to such Spiritual Person may, if he shall think fit, at the Prayer of any Person desiring to institute a Suit against such Spiritual Person, or of his own mere Motion, make Request to the Judge of the said Court of Arches or the Judge of the Chancery Court of *York*, as the Case may be, and that thereupon the said Judge shall accordingly proceed to take, treat, examine, and determine the Matter before himself or his Substitutes.

his client can be in the slightest degree promoted by it, or the issue of the cause be thus rendered at all more favourable to him.

Now however expedient it may be for the general purposes of justice, and the impartial administration of the laws, (for into that inquiry I do not now enter) that such should be the line of conduct pursued by an advocate, yet when the object of the proceeding is not to be “a divider between man and man,” but to advance the cause of Christ’s religion, I cannot conceive any process less in unison with the character of the proposed end, or less likely to promote true piety and the edification of the Church than this. No man I believe would wish the faults and irregularities of his own family to be so corrected ; but would prefer the exercise of paternal authority, dispassionately yet firmly applied, both to the discovery of truth, and to the punishment of offences. How much the success of a cause depends upon the advocate, and how little upon the discretion of the Judge, is the universal remark of all attentive observers of our Courts of Justice. It may be requisite for the maintenance of civil liberty that this should be so : but it continually demands of us a sacrifice of our best feelings, and of our natural love of justice, to this supposed political good. And as the end of Christianity is to make men virtuous, and holy, and charitable, and peaceable, rather than bold, and cunning, and independent, I cannot but deprecate any

unnecessary mixture of these earthly elements with the internal government of our Church.

In dismissing this topic, then, for the present, I must repeat the hope before expressed, that long consideration and frequent discussion will in this, as in many other important legislative measures, have had the effect of ultimately improving them. It certainly has led to a deeper inquiry into the principles of Church government, and a clearer insight into its original character, than before prevailed among the educated classes; and it is with no disrespectful feeling towards the lay practitioners in our Courts if I observe, by way of caution, that men naturally become enamoured of their art—that they are prone to magnify technical skill, and to lose sight of the end in their eager study of the means—that by long habit the legal merits supersede the moral character of a case in their contemplation—and that a long continued course even of successful practice requires to be corrected from time to time, like the mariner's reckoning upon the great ocean, by a reference to those heavenly guides which are appointed to rule the day and the night in this our pilgrimage upon earth.

Of the other legislative measures affecting the National Church I shall speak very briefly.

The law for the commutation of tithes appears to

operate as beneficially, and to proceed as amicably, as its warmest advocates ever anticipated. Much of this undoubtedly is owing to the deliberate manner, and even to the long delay, under which the measure was finally matured ; for it gave an opportunity for correcting prejudices, and for the subsidence of those agitated feelings, or rather of those fierce and ungovernable passions, which accompanied the first stages of the measure, and which almost always, more or less, blind men's judgment, not only to the rights of others, but to their own real interests. It is well too, that the administration of this law has been committed to upright, judicious, and experienced men, who have, I believe, discharged, and who continue to discharge the delicate trust confided to them with strict impartiality, and with a sincere regard to the interests of the Church. To you, my reverend brethren, it is hardly necessary for me to observe, that you are bound to act as Trustees and Guardians for your successors, not less than as men seeking the good will of those among whom you live. That you are disposed, and that you feel it your duty to let your moderation in this, as in all other transactions, be known unto all men, I am well assured. Yet you will allow me to remind you, that the good will of men is dearly purchased, if it lead an Incumbent to sacrifice the future interests of the benefice he holds, of which interests he and not his ecclesiastical superior is the best judge. The Bishop's sanction will be no acquittance of the

Incumbent's conscience, if he knowingly surrenders, either to the favour of a patron, or to the love of popularity, the fair and equitable claims of those who are to succeed him.

On the subject of National Education happily no law has been proposed—for I cannot but think, after the agitation of this subject which took place in Parliament, and the proceedings of Government connected with it, that any legislative measure that might have been proposed would have been erroneous and mischievous—grounded upon false and imperfect views—inconsistent with that fundamental principle, which we cherish as a great national blessing, the union of the Church with the State—and in its effects detrimental to the cause of true religion, as well as to the permanent interests of the nation. Much praise, therefore, and warm thanks are due to those distinguished men, chiefly of our own order, who boldly withstood an innovation which threatened to undermine the very principles upon which the Constitution of this country is based. The power, indeed, was not so formidable, the design was not so manifest, the mischief apprehended was not of so deep and fatal a character, as that which in the reign of James the Second received its death-blow, through the courage of those Bishops who then denounced the treacherous purpose of the Monarch, and boldly stopped its execution. But the cause was

of a similar kind, the promptitude and the vigour of the resistance was the same. And it affords the strongest assurance, that, while the Church retains a place for her representatives in Parliament, a vigilant eye will be kept on all such encroachments; and that the nation will never be taken unawares by any measures, however artfully devised and plausibly recommended, in order to procure the adherence of those who are enemies to the Established Church.

That some expedients are wanting to carry into full effect the admirable plan of the National Society, long ago digested and put in action, for the education of the poor I do not deny—and that the public mind required to be roused to a just sense of the importance of that duty, which had through time become neglected, as the best things are apt to do when the charm of novelty is over. But those who are old enough to remember the original formation and first operations of that Society, the universal ardour which was kindled throughout the kingdom, the active co-operation of the Clergy in the work, the institution of a central board and a central school in London, the building of schools by means of private subscription and of grants from the Society in all populous places, and the patronage which parochial schools simultaneously received from the Clergy and their wealthy neighbours; who remember, moreover, the introduction of a system of teaching, which not only made the simplest machinery applicable to

almost any extent of work, but which carried into effect, wherever a school was well superintended, that just and beautiful maxim, *qui docet discit*,—whoever, I say, recalls to his memory the stir and activity which pervaded every corner of the kingdom at that time, of which the evidence still exists in the multiplication of schools for the children of the poor, must admit that the recent movement is no new scheme, and that its promoters have no right to reflect upon the negligence or supineness of the preceding age. That the work is incomplete, that it does not realize all the anticipations which its authors and earliest supporters formed, is perfectly true; but in saying this, I class it only with every other benevolent scheme which requires the steady, active, unremitting co-operation and vigilance of many disinterested persons through a long course of years.

The history of all plans of this kind is nearly the same. After a few years the zeal abates, the first movers drop off, and are not succeeded by others equally active, and vigilant, and persevering. To continue and to preserve is not so animating a task as to found and to create. The institution is left more and more to its own rules and system. But it is hardly necessary for me to observe, that rules and systems will never of themselves perpetuate any institution—will never maintain it in health and vigour, however wisely framed. There must be a *living soul* breathed into them—a principle of energy, in-

telligence, and love—devoted to the duty, because it is a duty—correcting what is wrong, encouraging and rewarding what is right—never weary in well-doing—not coveting favour, or applause, or admiration, or distinction, but calmly and constantly counteracting the tendency to decay inherent in all human things. Without this the best and wisest rules will have been framed in vain.

This spirit can never be created by Acts of Parliament and Orders in Council. It must originate and be kept alive by a personal sense of duty, and therefore will vary and fluctuate with the several individuals that from time to time have the management of the institutions, and with the natural fickleness of the public mind.

Admiring then, as I do, the generous ardour of those who take a lead in this appeal to the public, I cannot but suspect that they have both overrated the actual want of new measures, and that they are not prepared for that relaxation, when the excitement is over, which ever attends such proceedings.

In regard to the alleged want of schools, I must enter my protest against the exaggerated statements which I continually see made of this evil, as well as of the inefficiency of those schools which are now in action. In places where a dense population has recently been collected, unless the capitalists who con-



gregate this population for their own enormous profit recognize the duty of providing for the religious instruction of the poor, there must be, and I grieve to say it, there often actually is a lamentable destitution. But that this is not the case even in the metropolis, except in certain districts of it, I confidently affirm. In some districts there is a concentration, as it were, of poverty and misery of every kind. To the relief of these districts the inhabitants of the richer parts, whether mercantile or not, who by resorting to the metropolis as a residence and spending their wealth there, create an immense population, ought surely to contribute, not only in their own immediate neighbourhood, but still more in the remote parishes which have not their due proportion of wealthy inhabitants, and of whose swarming population the conflux of rich families to the metropolis is the cause. They see them not, and therefore think they are not specially connected with them; and this makes it necessary that the truth should be plainly told, and their own duty forcibly pressed upon their attention. But the National Schools in the *City* of London, which are open to all the children of the poor, which are well taught and carefully visited, are not full. The number of children in most of them, is, I believe, less than it was many years ago. Yet there is no neglect on the part of the teachers, nor any absolute want of funds, although from the cause before alluded to there is a less abundant supply. But the novelty is passed away—and the interest

once excited in the neighbourhood becomes languid—and parents are negligent in sending their children when they find that no other benefit but that of instruction is obtained.

To this cause, the indifference and negligence and prejudice of parents, except some secular advantage is expected, must principally be ascribed the thin attendance at most of the National Schools in country towns and villages. Often the parents make a merit of sending their children, and expect to be favoured and rewarded for it—and threaten to remove them upon any offence or disgust, as if they were conferring a favour themselves by suffering them to remain. We may wonder and remonstrate and wish it were otherwise, but however much a school for the poor may flourish under the eye of a rich and benevolent neighbour, there is, alas! but one steadily operating cause in human nature on which uniform reliance can be placed—a sense of *secular advantage*. I do not say the poor are dead to all other motives; but this principle, like the great law of gravitation in the system of the universe, is the only one that can be reckoned upon as a constant self-acting power. There must be an external impulse from individuals, renewed from time to time, like that of muscular action in the animal body, or the motion once given soon dies away, and torpor gradually succeeds to a state of activity and energy.

Upon the duty of making religion the basis of general education, it is needless for me here to expatiate. It seems, indeed, to be admitted even by those, the tendency of whose plans we regard with most suspicion. But religion is a word of wide import. We of the Church of England mean not the same by it which Papists and Heretics and Sectarians of various denominations mean. Let me entreat you to enter into no compromise on this subject. Open the doors of your schools to all who are willing to come; but do not bribe them to come by a sacrifice of what you know to be sacred truth. Every attempt of the kind is abortive. It satisfies neither party; while it furnishes a weapon to our adversaries, and a means of undermining the Church when they are afraid to assail it openly.

A circular under an official form, though accredited by no name, has recently come to my hands, the object of which is to vindicate the plan lately condemned by the House of Lords, from the charges brought against it. The time would not now permit me to enter into a particular examination of this performance. It appears to me to be as deficient in all sound views of political philosophy, and even of that narrow branch of political philosophy which too often usurps its province—political economy, as it is in the weightier matters of religion. The examples taken from foreign countries, as guides for ourselves in this proposed work of National Education, have

no application to **England**. Almost all of them are the offspring of despotic governments, and involve compulsory measures, which in this country are impracticable, even if they were desirable. But in truth I suspect and I deprecate every experiment of this kind emanating from Government—I do not mean the Government of the day, but from any Government. The State has recognized a public instructor of the poor, the National Church. Let the governors and influential members of that Church be mindful of their duty; and if they offer instruction freely to the poor, they ought to be helped by Government, when the peculiar circumstances of any neighbourhood require it. We are the Almoners of the State for religious purposes. If other denominations of Christians apply for similar aid, let the State take care that it does not, by assisting *them*, indirectly assail the Church which it professes to maintain, and which, especially as regards the corruptions of Romanism, it is bound *exclusively* to maintain.

If the care of Government be extended to other objects besides moral and religious instruction, the Church does not claim any special favour. But I entertain serious doubts, whether it is for the public good that such matters should be under the control of Government—and whether they ought not to be left wholly to private competition, and to that desire of secular advantage, which is sufficiently strong to

raise up the means of instruction wherever they are wanted, without this encouragement, and which then undesignedly and unconsciously adjusts the provision made to the wants and circumstances of each particular neighbourhood.

The well known maxim of policy which has led to the cessation of all meddling interference of enlightened governments in commerce and agriculture is not inapplicable to these speculations.—*Leave us to ourselves*<sup>1</sup>. Society will work out its own good of a temporal nature, through the medium of private interest, much better than Government can do it for us: while the grand error into which all plans of centralization naturally fall—that of treating in the same manner districts wholly different in circumstances and habits—is thus avoided. Cities, towns, villages, rural parishes, present a diversified field to act upon. They require a policy often widely different, and specially adapted to their respective conditions: and it is from a neglect of this simple but important truth, that some recent laws have tended far and wide to demoralize the country, in order to remedy alleged abuses of a particular branch of trade in a few great towns.

In saying this, I must not be understood as dis-

<sup>1</sup> *Laissez nous faire* was the answer made by the French merchants when the minister Colbert consulted them as to the measures Government might frame for their benefit.

couraging the plan for providing schools for the education of children *above the lower class* ; but the provision thus made ought not, in my opinion, to exceed what is necessary for the commencement of such an undertaking. If it succeeds, and deserves to succeed, it will support itself. If it fails for want of funds, it will be evidence that the thing is not called for by the circumstances of that place and neighbourhood. The design is, in fact, analogous to that, which in the reign of Edward the Sixth, greatly aided the reformation of religion. Schools were founded in almost every town for teaching the learned languages to the upper and middle classes of the laity ; and thus Popery was driven from one of its strong holds, the ignorance of the people. She had, like the Pharisees of old, taken away the key of knowledge, and yet entered not in herself. These schools, however, having accomplished their purpose, after the lapse of less than a century were found to be more numerous than were wanted. The complaint was made so early as the reign of James the First, by the greatest philosopher and the most enlightened statesman of that age ; one whom the innovators of the present day are fond of exalting as a model of wisdom, in all that respects the practical improvement of mankind, as well as in enlarging the boundaries of human knowledge and extending the empire of mind over the material universe. Speaking of these schools in a formal address to his Sovereign, Lord Bacon declares, that there are already too many of

them ; and that they only furnish out when thus unduly multiplied materials for sedition and revolution <sup>1</sup>. These institutions still remain entire, although in very many instances dormant and useless. Being endowed by law with funds destined to a certain species of instruction, although it differs from what society after a lapse of ages now requires, yet the legal trustees must act according to the deed of grant, and the property cannot be diverted to any other channel. If some of these funds could, by process of law or by legislative enactment, be transferred to the uses now contemplated, it would be a solid benefit to the community, and would be an exemplification of that great man's doctrine, (who well deserves all the panegyric bestowed upon him) in his Essay on Innovation. He recommends us to keep pace with the silent inno-

<sup>1</sup> " Concerning the advancement of learning, I do subscribe to the opinion of one of the wisest and greatest men of your kingdom : That for grammar schools *there are already too many*, and therefore no providence to add where there is excess : for the great number of schools which are in your Highness' realm, does cause a want, and doth cause likewise an overflow ; both of them inconvenient, and one of them dangerous. For by means thereof *they find want in the country and towns, both of servants for husbandry, and apprentices for trade* ; and on the other side, there being more scholars bred than the State can prefer and employ ; and the active part of that life not bearing a proportion to the preparative, it must needs fall out, that many persons will be bred unfit for other vocations, and unprofitable for that in which they are brought up ; which fills the realm full of indigent, idle, and wanton people, which are but *materia rerum novarum*."—*Lord Bacon's Advice to the King touching Mr. Sutton's Estate.*

vations of time by corresponding innovations, gradually and progressively, not hastily and abruptly, made in our social institutions <sup>1</sup>.

In the absence, however, of such resources an experiment will I hope soon be made in some populous district, perhaps in more than one, of this Diocese, of a school better adapted to the wants of the age; while the spirit which led to the formation of the National Society, and to the establishment of parochial schools in connexion with the Church, will, I trust, be every where revived—and still more the spirit of giving personal attention and encouragement to their daily duties.

The Clergy will, I am sure, take a leading part in this labour of love, and I doubt not we may thus

<sup>1</sup> "Surely every medicine is an innovation, and he that will not apply new remedies must expect new evils; for time is the greatest innovator; and if time of course alter things to the worse, and wisdom and counsel shall not alter them to the better, what will be the end?"

It were good therefore, that men in their innovations would follow the example of time itself, which indeed innovateth greatly, but *quietly and by degrees scarce to be perceived.* . . .

It is good also not to try experiments in states, except the necessity be urgent, or the utility evident; and well to beware that it be the reformation that draweth on the change, and not the desire of change that pretendeth the reformation."—*Lord Bacon, Essay 29. Of Innovations.*



supersede the necessity of inspection by strangers, who have little knowledge of local peculiarities, who come with their authorized table of weights and measures, and are too apt to apply the same standard to many widely different cases.

In all these operations, one leading purpose should be, to consolidate the elements of the National Church—to make people know and feel the sacred duty of maintaining a connexion with that household of faith—to guard them against the corruptions and the arts of Popery on the one hand, and the unapostolical unscriptural practice, the unquestionable sin of causeless separation on the other. If our enemies of both these descriptions are now unusually active—if, in order to compass our ruin, they join hand in hand, forming an unnatural compact cemented by their common hatred of us—as Herod and Pilate were made friends by mutual hostility against Christ—let us, who value and who love the sanctuary, unite firmly for its defence in the hour of danger. It is a comfort to observe many instances of men differing widely in their political opinions and partialities, yet dropping their differences at the present crisis, and labouring heartily and zealously in the common cause of the Church. To this great end all our influence, as individuals and as members of the civil community, ought now to be directed. The attempts that are daily made to abridge the privileges and to diminish the resources of the Established

Church all proceed from one motive, or by necessary consequence they all involve this one position, that there ought to be no National Church. Let this then be the rallying point for uniting the members of the Church in their civil capacity ; and while we are careful to observe the rule of living, as far as in us lies, peaceably with all men, let us offer an uncompromising resistance to every design which tends to weaken ourselves, or to strengthen the hands of those who wish evil to our Sion.

That the state of the Church in this Diocese has greatly improved of late years, and is continually improving, in all those respects which depend upon the conduct of the Clergy, I assert with confidence, and with a grateful acknowledgment to Almighty God for His blessing and protection. In the condition of the Churches, in the residence of the Clergy, in the regular performance of divine service at stated hours, in the increase of parochial duty both within and without the Church, in the establishment of daily and Sunday schools, in the building of glebe-houses, where there was either none or no fit house of residence, in all these points we have abundant cause for congratulation. If sectarian habits still prevail, there is every year less and less excuse for them, on the plea that the ministration of the Church is negligently, or coldly, or inadequately performed. Separation from the Church is not now to be laid to the charge of its ministers.

If the people wilfully and without cause put away from them the word of life offered by us, on them be the blame. We are not partakers in the sin. Neither be you, my brethren, disheartened and cast down, if those whom you invite turn away from you. So did they often from One who is greater than you; and who submitted perhaps to this wrong in His own person, among other wise and benevolent reasons, in order that, having this example ever before your eyes, you should not faint and be weary in your minds, or apprehensive that His care is withdrawn from your ministry, or that you are deemed unworthy labourers in His vineyard. The disciple is not above his Master. If there were men who rejected Him, and walked no more after Him, so is it not to be wondered if they should often reject you. Only be careful that you give no just cause for this apostacy,—that you disclose to them faithfully the whole counsel of God,—that you instruct them in the duty of Church union, the last and most earnest injunction of their dying Saviour to His disciples—that you warn them of their peril, and earnestly and affectionately exhort them not to sin against their own souls; not to “do despite to the Spirit of grace:” not, by despising you, to despise Him that sent you.

Lastly, I would entreat you, my reverend brethren, not to disparage your Church, or give encouragement to those who disallow it and break from

it, by yielding even *in name* to their pretensions. To bestow the title Catholic upon the Romish Church as contradistinguished from our own, is practically injurious, not only with uneducated people, but it has actually been employed in controversial argument as a proof of *their* superiority, and of *our* recent origin. To speak of theirs as the old faith or the old religion, and of the Protestant confessions as a new form of Christianity, has an equally injurious tendency. The truth as you well know is, that *ours* is the old faith. Let us, however, drop altogether the distinction of old and new, and adopt that of genuine and corrupt. There is but one faith, one religion, one Church, from the beginning :—that Church has been for ages grossly corrupted by the influence of Popery; and it has been more or less reformed, and restored to its original purity, by Protestants in different parts of the Christian world. We of this land have accomplished the work more thoroughly and yet more temperately than any other nation. Let us cherish this great and glorious work as our dearest possession; at the same time never let us give way by submission, no, not for an hour, to that spirit of schism and separation, which is directly opposed to the very constitution of the Church as founded by Christ and his Apostles, as placed on record in the Holy Scriptures, and as transmitted to us through the uniform practice of the first and purest ages. Do not, I beseech you, under a false plea of liberality and charity, counten-

ance that pernicious error, by which self-appointed teachers usurp the ministry and distract the Church, to draw away disciples after them, when they already have a faithful minister at hand able and willing to lead them in the way of salvation. Be not deterred, by the fear of incurring the reproach of men, from maintaining steadily the high privilege and the sacred dignity of your calling; but rather bear in mind the saying of our Lord, (which has especial reference, not to moral conduct, but to this temporizing and spurious liberality in the messengers of God) "Woe be unto you when all men shall speak well of you; for so did they of the false prophets who were before you:" and, be assured, that in so doing, you will have ample recompence for any transient persecution in the peace of your own conscience here, and in the approval hereafter of that Divine Master whom you serve.



THE END.

2  
A

# CHARGE,

DELIVERED TO THE  
CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF QUEBEC,

BY

GEORGE J. MOUNTAIN, D.D.

LORD BISHOP OF MONTREAL,

(ADMINISTERING THAT DIOCESE,)

AT HIS

PRIMARY VISITATION,

COMPLETED IN 1838.



---

QUEBEC, PRINTED 1839 :

LONDON :

RE-PRINTED FOR J. G. F. & J. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD,

AND WATERLOO PLACE, FLEET MALL.

---

1839.

LONDON :  
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,  
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

AN apology is due to my brethren of the Clergy for the tardiness of my compliance with their desire, most kindly expressed, that I should publish the following Charge: but I believe that they will themselves know how to make my excuse.

It may be proper to mention, that in consequence of my having been under the impression that the Charge was rather long, the whole of it was not delivered at any one time; but every part of it was delivered either in one or other of the places, where the Clergy were assembled for the visitation, and every essential part was delivered in all.

Since the following sheets were first put to press, the Report of the late Governor General and High Commissioner has been received in this country. It is impossible that any thing can more strongly and more ominously exemplify the correctness of the remarks made in pp. 10—12 of the Charge. Let the Clergy stand prepared. Let them not be parties to any surrender of what they conscientiously believe to be the claims and interests of the Church, but let them judge what may be likely to follow in the end, if statements such as those in the following extracts from the document just mentioned, should really be



taken as the basis of legislation, and the guide of government. Let them observe also the commendation bestowed in other quarters and withheld from themselves, upon points where I am thankful to say that He who sees all, and whose approbation is all in all, knows that they are, as a body, richly entitled to it. Let them be assured that, with the Divine blessing, I will not be wanting in any feeble endeavours of mine to procure them justice, but let them *discern*, in the necessity for those endeavours, *the signs of the times*.

No person at all acquainted with the facts of the case respecting the alleged powers of Rectors—the proceedings of the Church in the maintenance of its pretensions, the working of the voluntary principle on this side of the Atlantic, the proportion of the poorer classes who belong to the Church of England, and the exertions of the Church Clergy, not only in the field of Missionary labour, but in the Missionary character which very generally attaches to their ordinary duties, can fail to see at once how these facts are not simply at variance, but pointedly contrasted with the impressions which persons unfriendly to the Church appear to have made it their business to communicate to the mind of His Excellency, and which, through his Report, have been communicated to the British government, legislature, and people.

*Marchmont, near Quebec,*

*April, 1839.*

## EXTRACTS.

---

\* \* \* But the last public act of Sir John Colborne before quitting the government of the province, in 1835, which was the establishment of the fifty-seven Rectories, has completely changed the aspect of the question. It is understood that every Rector possesses all the spiritual and other privileges enjoyed by an English Rector; and that, though he may have no right to levy tithes (for even this has been made a question), he is, *in all other respects, in precisely the same position as a Clergyman of the Established Church in England.* \* \* \* \* \*

The Church of England in Upper Canada, *by numbering in its ranks all those who belong to no other sect,* represents itself as being more numerous than any single denomination of Christians in the country. \* \*

The superiority of what is called the *voluntary principle*, is a question on which I may almost say that there is *no difference of opinion in the United*

*States*, and it cannot be denied that on this, as on other points, the tone of thought prevalent in the Union has exerted a very considerable influence over the neighbouring provinces.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Church, too, for which alone it is proposed that the State should provide, is the Church which, being that of the wealthy, can best provide for itself, and has *the fewest poor to supply with gratuitous religious instruction*. Another consideration which distinguishes the grounds on which such a question must be decided in old and new countries is, that the state of society in the latter is not susceptible of such an organization as is necessary for the efficiency of any Church Establishment of which I know, *more especially of one so constituted as the Established Church of England*; for the essence of the Establishment is its Parochial Clergy. The services of a Parochial Clergy are almost inapplicable to a colony, where a constantly varying population is widely scattered over the country. *Any Clergy there must be rather Missionary than Parochial*.

A

## C H A R G E,

&c.

---

REVEREND BRETHREN,

AT the time when I made my Visitation of the Lower Province<sup>1</sup>, for the inspection of the Churches and the Confirmation of young persons who had been prepared for that rite, the late Bishop of Quebec was still living and I was acting simply as his delegate. This circumstance, to make no mention of some other considerations which conspired with it, appeared to me to dispense with the necessity, if not to forbid the propriety, of my calling together any portion of my brethren to receive the episcopal charge.

The independent administration of the Diocese having since passed into my hands, (although no appointment to the See of Quebec has taken place,) and the protraction of those negotiations which were long ago set on foot for the erection of a separate

<sup>1</sup> In the beginning of 1837, and for the district of Gaspé, in the Gulph of St. Lawrence, in the summer of that year.

See at Toronto, and of which the speedier issue, if successful, would have withheld me from making the Visitation of Upper Canada, having now decided me to leave that Province no longer without the personal ministrations of the Bishop, I have judged that it might be of mutual advantage that when thus engaged in completing the Visitation, I should meet my brethren in a body at those different points in the enormous extent of this Diocese, of which their convenience would indicate the choice<sup>1</sup>.

I have expressed the hope that our meeting may be of mutual advantage, and although I wish to say as little as possible, I must here say something which personally regards myself. If I do not despair, that, by the Divine blessing, the advice which I am now about to offer, or other more familiar suggestions made during your stay, may be of use to you in the exercise of your duties, I certainly no less anticipate that I may derive benefit from the opportunity thus afforded of our taking sweet counsel together, and walking in the house of God as friends. I see among you those to whom I might say, *I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee*

<sup>1</sup> They were assembled accordingly, for the Lower Province, at Quebec and Montreal. It was in compliance with the desire of the Clergy themselves in Upper Canada, a desire founded upon the obvious inconvenience of deliberating in two distinct bodies at a distance from each other, upon some matters in which it was necessary to come to one conclusion,—that the Visitation of the whole Province was fixed at Toronto, instead of being held both at that place and at Kingston.

*by the putting on of my hands*, and who of course are young in the Ministry, but I pray you to believe that I am ready to receive help from all, and want all the help that I can receive. I scarcely need assure you that I am sensible how much I need your indulgence of judgment, and your prayers that I may be guided and prospered in the task which has devolved upon feeble and unworthy hands. You will not suspect that they are words of course which I use. I do not affect to deny that I have had some experience of ecclesiastical affairs, or that there are circumstances which give me an adaptation to certain local peculiarities in the charge; and if I were not conscious, in addition to these considerations, of possessing such general qualifications as enable me in some small measure to sustain the respectability of the office,—above all, if I did not humbly trust that God has given me some concern for the grand objects of that as well as of other offices in the Christian Ministry,—I could not have been justified in accepting it, although if I had not done so, the Church in Canada, from circumstances with which you are acquainted, would have been seen for an indefinite time without a Bishop. But if I had reason to shrink beforehand from the charge, I do solemnly assure you, that in the occupation of it, I daily feel cause to tremble.

Among the difficulties now attaching to the charge, is one circumstance which in another point of view would seem to be an eminent advantage—namely, that I have to take up and carry on the labours left to me

by such a man as the Bishop of Quebec. It is not my purpose to enlarge upon the character of that devoted servant of the Lord, whose race, in our weak apprehension, seems to have run out too soon. Upwards of a year has now elapsed since his decease, and in accordance with the voice which was lifted to lament him in every quarter where his name had been known, we have rendered our testimony, in different ways, to his zeal in the cause of that Master for whom it was his glory to spend and to be spent. We all personally loved him : many of us were specially obliged to him, and for myself I can truly say, that his long and unvarying friendship for me is among the most treasured recollections of my life. But with such a name as he had and so nobly earned, and with some advantages at his command which I do not possess, he has bequeathed to me a task in the execution of which you will feel that I can ask no fitter prayer from you than that a portion of that spirit by which he was animated may be shed down upon me from the Father of lights.

Upon this occasion of our first meeting as we now meet, it appears natural and proper that I should call upon you to contemplate with me for our own profit, the actual state both of the Church of England at large, and of that portion of it in particular, which has been planted in the Diocese of Quebec. The position of the Church, whether general or local, is in some points of view, critical, and even alarming ; and a very exact application may be made to the existing

circumstances in which she is placed, of the language used by an ancient father, with reference to his own day upon the earth : “ The times are difficult : those who conspire against us are many ;” with the addition, as it respects too many of her professed adherents, of the words which follow,—“ the genuine spirit of love has become extinct <sup>1</sup>.” Parties in the mother country very widely at variance with each other upon the subject of Religion, appear to have cast their heads together with one consent, and to be confederate against her ; and from the character of the times, these parties are rendered formidable in a way which the merits of their cause could never make them. The ruling powers at home, perhaps in many instances feeling or conceiving their position to be one in which they can only say, *non est ista nostra culpa sed temporum*, are found scarcely to afford justice to interests which are identified with the cause of established authority and order, and the maintenance of what is venerable in human institutions ; and the ungenerous cry of those who have found their own opportunities of advancement or distinction in exciting odium against the Church, aided by the unconsidered statements of others whose war against old préjudices is in fact the great prejudice of their own minds, has been allowed to prevail too far against claims which are at once legitimate in themselves and connected with the highest interests of man.

<sup>1</sup> Χαλεπὸς ὁ καιρὸς, οἱ ἐπιβουλεύοντες πολλοί· τὸ τῆς ἀγάπης γνήσιον ἀπόλωλεν.—*Chrysostom de Sacerdotio*.



In this Diocese we have experienced our full share of the effect of these principles upon the prosperity and efficiency of the Church. We have risen, indeed, by the Divine blessing, since the Church first assumed a consistent form under the auspices of one whom I forbear to name<sup>1</sup>,—we have risen from very feeble beginnings, to a state in which we now number considerably above a hundred Clergymen, with many orderly and devout congregations. Yet constituted as we are an integral portion of the Established Church of England, we have, from unpropitious circumstances, been left to occupy in the eye of the world a dubious position, and to appear in an equivocal character; our claims still unsettled, and the support of our Clergy partial, meagre, and precarious, to the infinite detriment of religion, and the manifest perpetuation of those very jealousies and contentions of which the apprehension has dictated this temporizing policy, but of which the existence is to be traced to the want of an avowed and decided maintenance of the Church-Establishment as it was originally planned. With you, however, my Reverend Brethren, I need not enter into particulars upon this topic. We have done, and, by God's help, shall continue to do our part, I trust in all charity and meekness, to urge and to uphold what we believe to be our own right, the glory of a Christian Government and the blessing of a land: the issue we must

<sup>1</sup> See note A.

confide to the hands of God. What I am anxious to bring under your notice is, first, the great comfort and ground of thankfulness which we enjoy in all the difficulties and struggles of the Church ; and secondly, the peculiar responsibility which we contract under the circumstances of the time.

With reference to the first point, I do believe that there never was a period in which the Church of England, considered as a whole, presented an aspect so satisfactory as at this day. I do not mean to say that the Church-Establishment is faultless, or that any branch of the Church on earth will ever be totally and literally *without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing*. We shall always have reason, if perfection be insisted upon, to say, as was said in a Latin distich by one who was a burning and shining light in the Church of England,—

They want that the Church should be free from every speck :  
This the present life denies ; the future life will afford it <sup>1</sup>.

But when we see what a spirit, within the memory of living man, it has pleased God to shed down upon the Church ; how many evils have been corrected and what new life has been infused into the whole system ; when we witness the sincerity and the fervour with which Christ crucified is proclaimed by the Clergy ; when we behold with what true fidelity and zeal a great and still increasing portion of that

<sup>1</sup> Optant ut careat maculis Ecclesia cunctis :  
Præsens vita negat ; vita futura dabit.— *Bernard Gilpin*.

body devote themselves to the labours of the pastoral charge, and what care is taken by the rulers of the Church to preserve a high standard of character and qualifications among her Ministers; when we contemplate the variety and the magnitude of efforts made within the Church for the diffusion of spiritual blessings at home and abroad; when we look at the prodigious multiplication of our places of worship in England<sup>1</sup>, and the progressive enlargement of Associations for the promotion of education and the communication of religious light, and then turn our regards to what is done, with little aid from the State, for distant dependencies of the Empire, and darkened corners of the earth,—for Colonist, for Gentile, and for Jew; when we see what an energetic piety, what a noble munificence in religious works<sup>2</sup>, what a love for the National Establishment, what a growing attachment to Church principles, is manifested among the laity as well as the Clergy, and is found often in the highest orders of the realm; when we consider that although the establishment of Colonial Bishoprics is still lamentably insufficient and most unworthy of the Empire, yet the formation of two Sees in the West Indies, and four, including Australia, in the East, has taken place within the recollection of all here present,—we have surely ground to bless the name of our God, in the synoptical survey of these interesting facts, for the mercy which

<sup>1</sup> See Note B.

<sup>2</sup> See Note C.

He has granted to us, with all our sins, that our Church should not fall behind in the race ; and we should be encouraged to believe that He has not cast her off, but that a distinguished part is reserved for her in forwarding the blessed consummation, when *the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of God, as the waters cover the sea.*

While we are permitted, however, to exult in these thoughts, we must remember, with a heightened sense of responsibility, what interest we have in charge—THE INTEREST OF CHRIST ON EARTH, to the promotion of which “one thing” we have vowed “as much as in us lies, wholly to apply ourselves, laying aside the study of the world and of the flesh<sup>1</sup>.” If the times are difficult and there are many adversaries ; if, at the same time, a great spirit of religion has been awakened in the world, and different parties are seen emulous of each other in seeking to advance the kingdom of God ; if the Clergy of the Church of England are posted in a conspicuous station, and are eminently as a city set upon a hill, which cannot be hid ;—if our brethren in other quarters, strong in the power of faith, are doing great things in the cause,—striving successfully against the tide of worldly opposition, and surmounting, in some instances, the threatening waves of trouble ; if the present conjuncture is highly critical with reference to the ecclesiastical affairs of these provinces, and consequences of vast

<sup>1</sup> Ordination of Priests.

importance to future generations in this rising country may depend upon the foundation now laid for the Church,—then, amidst all these incitements to vigilance and zeal, it will be required of us that we be found *with our loins girded and our lights burning, and like unto men that wait for their Lord*. And if the signs of the times appear pregnant with great events, and the astonishing advances of science, more especially in its practical application to the purposes of international communication, seem destined, in the hands of Providence, to open the way for a new and marked era of the Gospel, which, according to the anticipations of many religious persons, may be preceded and introduced by scenes of trial and sore tribulation in the Church,—then we are solemnly called upon, not simply as the soldiers of the Cross, but as the leaders of the battle, to *take unto us the whole armour of God*, that we may be able to *withstand in the evil day, and having done all to stand*.

Having touched, however, upon the signs of the times, and the prospects of the universal Church of Christ, I feel it necessary to advert to the extreme diffidence and reverent caution with which we should pronounce upon yet unaccomplished prophecy, and indulge our speculations, too apt to lead to presumptuous error, upon the magnificent future of the Gospel victorious in the world. *It is not for us to know the times or seasons which the Father hath put in his own power*. And hence I take occasion—looking at certain incidental effects which are connected with great

efforts in religion, in modern, as they have been in earlier times, to recommend the Christian grace of moderation : a holy moderation and sobriety in all the varied exercise of ministerial duty ; in the methods adopted for the propagation of the truth of God—yes, and in the very preaching of the blessed doctrines of grace. If what I recommend seem to be the cowardly accommodation to the world for which the fervent Paul would have *withstood us to the face*, or the lukewarmness of spirit which Christ will indignantly reject, then, my brethren, stop your ears against my words. But in that combination which is charged upon Christian teachers of the qualities of the serpent with those of the dove, great discretion and great gentleness appear to be implied : and it is known to have been a distinguishing characteristic of our own reformers that they shunned some extremes to which others in the heat of the struggle were carried away. The mild and moderate Melancthon, among foreign reformers, was not found to turn his back in the hour of danger. In the religion of the Gospel, as well as in other things which engage the mind of man, there are certain bounds within or without which, that which is right cannot stand<sup>1</sup>. Although it is most certainly true, that we can never be too religious or too devoted, yet it is equally certain that in the developement and the exercise of the

<sup>1</sup> ——— sunt certi denique fines

Quos intrà citràque nequit consistere rectum.

religious affections, there is often, through the infirmity of nature, a tendency to religious irregularity and to what may properly be called religious excess. In those points especially which create parties and party names within the bosom of the Church itself, the most vehement and eager spirits on either side will not be found, I believe, to be the nearest to the truth; and the approximation of parties to each other, each losing something of its own and borrowing from its opposite, is, according to my own convictions, the issue for which we should devoutly pray and for every manifestation of which (and these are not few) we should render thanks to our God.

I apprehend that there is no one doctrine of the Gospel which does not receive the tincture of error, when pushed to an extreme; and we are sometimes accused of not going far enough, when the very fact of our stopping where we do, is the evidence of our keeping step, if I may use so familiar an illustration, with the Gospel itself. Truth exaggerated is not higher truth: it is rather truth deteriorated by some alloy. Instances might be given, without number, to support the justice of this remark; and we see it very plainly exemplified, if we have recourse to the stronger shades of difference among believers in Revelation upon certain points of their faith. Because one party will lower and dilute to nothing the vital doctrine of the work of the Spirit in the heart and understanding, another deals in sensible revelations and impulses, or proceeds to the extravagance of

claiming the miraculous gifts of Apostolic times :— because one party preaches the law rather than the Gospel, another seeking to magnify the covenant of grace, will tread upon the verge of Antinomian error : because one party makes religion consist in forms and ritual observances, another makes it an evidence of spirituality to depreciate, or even to dispense with, the very Sacraments themselves.

Upon similar principles, I cannot forbear from stating my opinion that we ought to manifest a wise spirit of allowance and charitable construction in some lesser matters relating to particular habits, usages, observances, or religious phraseology. Things which are often found among the *accidental characteristics* are thence liable to be regarded as the *necessary evidences* of a devoted piety and a genuine faith in Christ. There are many things in human life, many more than some religious persons are willing to allow, which must be left to the province of Christian liberty and discretion,—and of which it must be said that neither if we do them are we the better, nor if we do them not, the worse, and *vice versâ* ; what may be inexpedient for one man, may be conceded to another—nothing being insisted upon as of universal obligation, which does not carry the distinct warrant of the word of God—no burthen imposed which would not have been imposed by the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem.

Upon this subject of moderation, I am not ashamed to have recourse to the support of a female writer—



the late Mrs. Hannah More,—the preface to whose work on Practical Piety contains the following pertinent remarks:—

“ Would it could not be said that religion has her parties as well as politics. Those who endeavour to steer clear of all extremes in either, are in danger of being reprobated by both. It is rather a hardship for persons who have considered it as a Christian duty to cultivate a spirit of moderation in thinking, and of candour in judging, that when these dispositions are brought into action they frequently incur a harsher censure than the errors which it was their chief aim to avoid.

“ Perhaps, therefore,” she continues, “ to that human wisdom whose leading object is human applause, it might answer best to be exclusively attached to some one party. On the protection of that party at least, it might in that case reckon; and it would then have the dislike of the opposite class alone to contend against; while those who cannot go all lengths with either, can hardly escape the disapprobation of both.”

These remarks, as it appears to me, are very applicable not only to the judgments which we pronounce, but to the part which we feel called upon to take with reference to the professors of the Roman Catholic religion<sup>1</sup>. I would willingly avoid this topic; but duty forbids my passing it without notice.

<sup>1</sup> See Note D.

I conceive that it is our manifest duty, as, if we have any love to the souls of men, it must be our earnest desire, wherever a door seems opened to us by the hand of Providence, to propagate the simple truth of God, and to declare Jesus Christ to sinners as their Saviour, in a manner in which he cannot be presented to them by a system encumbered with human devices, and, according to the language of our own Articles, plainly repugnant, in many points, to the word of God. And so far, I think, we shall be all agreed. But with respect to the most eligible and judicious mode in which we can prosecute the object of advancing the cause of Scriptural truth, a great diversity of opinion may exist among persons equally concerned for the honour of God ; and it is at least a question whether more is not likely to be ultimately done towards the attainment of this object, by a prudent and moderate course of proceeding, and very often by the unobserved working of a holy leaven in the mass of society,—the indirect influence of a purer faith, as recommending itself by its fruits, and winning friends by its deportment, than by the provocation of a public challenge, or the disturbance of an impetuous assault upon the host encamped around us under the banner of Rome <sup>1</sup>. One thing is plain :—that our *first* duty is to our own followers ; our care of them, with the limited resources which we have at

<sup>1</sup> This applies to a particular portion of the Diocese—namely, that portion of Lower Canada which is inhabited by the old French population.

command, seems likely for a long time to be more than sufficient to fill our hands, and our incursions in other quarters may be reserved till we have means and energies to spare, after supplying our own ill-provided people; at least we must take care that nothing is left undone for their direct benefit, because we are engaged in a different employment of our zeal. The Apostles, in the execution of their commission, and the choice of their field of labour, were directed by the revelations of the Spirit of God: we can only gather from circumstances what it is the will of God that we should attempt and make our experiments, seeking such light as is now vouchsafed in answer to the prayer of faith, according to the result which appearances may promise.

I desire, however, my reverend brethren, to have it well understood, that whatever charity of judgment, whatever Christian courtesy of language, whatever prudent caution of proceeding for the very sake of advancing the interests of truth, it may be proper to manifest in this behalf, I am most fully alive to the necessity of our making a resolute stand against that spirit which walks abroad, and to which, by a mere perversion of language, the name of *liberality* is often conceded; a spirit which confounds all distinction between truth and error, and absolutely tends to nullify the effect of revelation. Certain wonderful truths are made known to us from heaven: the correct application of those truths furnishes the remedy for our moral and spiritual disorders, and

conveys to the soul of man the principle of everlasting life. The preservation of those truths, therefore, in their purity as well as their integrity, liable as they are, through the corruption of nature, to be obscured and debased, is among the foremost duties of the Church, and the most solemnly important concerns of human society. Any compromise of Scriptural principles of religion becomes, in this point of view, alike dangerous and sinful; and we should warn those who are spiritually under our charge, that they do not suffer themselves to be led into any such compromise from motives either of domestic ease, of social good understanding, of commercial interest, or of political expediency. In all these points the world will often be found at issue with the Gospel of God, and we must only say to them, *Choose ye this day whom ye will serve*. And if we encounter odium in this discharge of our duty, we must call to mind the words of an Apostle, *Marvel not, my brethren, if the world hate you*, and those of our blessed Lord himself, *Ye know that it hated me before it hated you*.

We should warn our people also, when we are upon the subject of political differences and agitations, of the awful responsibility which they will incur, if they are forgetful of the scenes through which we have all recently passed. The right hand of God was so conspicuously stretched forth, and in so many different ways, in the protection of the cause of loyalty, when the insurrection broke out in these

provinces<sup>1</sup>, as to extort, even from the unthinking, a devout acknowledgment of Providential interposition. And we had public fasts, and proclaimed thanksgivings. All must not end there. We must, as a community, rejoice with trembling in our deliverance; and remember that fresh scourges are ready in the hand of God. We must be humbled under a sense of our sins,—thankful for the mercy which we have experienced, watchful against forgetfulness of Divine judgment, fruitful in those Christian works which are prompted by all these combined considerations. And it will be happy if the Clergy can be instrumental, not only in cherishing that spirit of loyalty which must characterize the true followers of the Church, but in convincing any unthinking part of the population of the great wickedness, as well as folly, of seditious agitations in a country where, if there has been a fault chargeable upon the government, it is that of an unwise relaxation of the authority reposed in its hands for the common good. Never can,—I will not say rebellion,—but never can those proceedings which *tend to rebellion* be suffered to pass under the colour of the mere maintenance of a different side in politics. Where can there be worse authors of mischief than those who, not to speak of bloodshed and devastation of property, disturb and distract a peaceful country, and blast the

<sup>1</sup> In the end of 1837 and commencement of 1838.

rising prosperity of a people, to serve the purposes of faction?—or, if men acknowledge the authority of the word of God, what sin is there more broadly stamped with the brand of the Divine displeasure, than the sin of those who *resist and despise power and are not afraid to speak evil of dignities?* Warn, therefore, all who are in danger, as the messengers of God. *Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers; to obey magistrates; to be ready to every good work; to submit themselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake.* Charge them in the words of wisdom, *My son, fear thou the Lord and the King, and meddle not with them that are given to change.*

Before dismissing the subject of the uncompromising maintenance of principle in opposition to that which passes in the world for liberality, I must offer a very few observations relating to what are sometimes called the peculiarities of the Established Church. I shall not occupy your time by an endeavour to refute the shallow and unscriptural notion that Christian unity and charity consist in the establishment of a commodious sort of understanding among parties divided in religious communion, that they *agree to differ*. Certainly they ought to endeavour to live in peace, and in the interchange of all christian good offices; and it is equally certain that each ought to rejoice in every instance in which another may promote the cause of Christ, and be ready to put the most *liberal* construction, (I do not avoid the use of the word, for true liberality is a beautiful

feature of the Gospel) upon all the proceedings of separate bodies, or individuals belonging to them. We ought to honour and to imitate all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, although they *walk not with us*. And it would be as difficult to deny, as it would be criminal to wish to deny, that the blessing and grace of God is often with those whose ministry we regard as irregularly constituted. But with all this, I conceive that we place ourselves in a very false position, and fail to act, in one point, the part which God has assigned to us in the world, if ever we adopt that language or lend ourselves to those proceedings in which the Church is regarded as a Sect among Sects. It is quite foreign to my purpose to argue here the question of Episcopacy: but if we believe that the Apostles founded and framed an Episcopal Church; if we trace the plan of such a Church in the Scriptures; if following up our enquiries to throw light on the question by comparison of Scripture with early ecclesiastical records, we arrive at that conclusion which enables us with the incomparable Hooker to challenge the opponents of our system, that they show *but one Church upon the face of the whole earth*, from the Apostolic times to the Reformation, that was not episcopal<sup>1</sup>; if all the remnants of ancient Churches now existing in the East have preserved this constitution from their beginning, and our own Church has opened interesting

<sup>1</sup> See Note E.

communications with them which may be designed to lead the way to their renovation in holy communion with ourselves<sup>1</sup>; if the real strength of Rome consists only in the multiplied divisions and unseemly disarray of the Protestant Churches; if this can never be cured, so long as the vicious principle is admitted that Christians may lawfully form new societies, and create new Ministries at will; if it was the singular blessing of our own, among other Churches, at the Reformation, to preserve the ancient order and the uninterrupted succession of her hierarchy; if, lastly, these principles are so pointedly recognized, so fully received and acted upon in her practice, that we accept the orders as valid, of a Romish priest who recants, although we re-ordain all Protestant Ministers who pass over to us from non-episcopal Churches, then, with this chain of facts before our eyes, I do conceive that we are wanting alike in our consistency as Churchmen, and our duty in the Church universal, if, swayed by the stream of prevailing opinion, studying an ill-understood popularity, or even prompted by an amiable spirit of conciliation, we consent to prejudice the exclusive character of our Ministry, and voluntarily descend from the ground which we occupy with our people and other Protestant Episcopalians, as a distinct and peculiar body among the Churches.

And is this to exalt ourselves, and to preach ourselves instead of Christ Jesus our Lord? Far other-

<sup>1</sup> See Note F.



wise than this if rightly considered, our claims to Apostolic order and succession, as is well pointed out by a late excellent Colonial prelate<sup>1</sup>, should humble us in the dust under a sense of the greatness of our calling so far above our worthiness and strength. Whatever affords a heightened view of the office which we hold, and the part which we have to sustain in the Church of God, can only—or should only,—prompt us to deeper earnestness in seeking that sufficiency which is of Him alone.

I bless God that there is not wanting good evidence among us of our having recourse to that sufficiency—but what a field is before us! how ought we each to labour that we may gather with our Lord, and how importunately to pray that more labourers may be sent forth into the ripening harvest which spreads itself around us; that larger blessing may descend upon those institutions at home, (foremost among which we must mention the venerable and munificent Societies for the Propagation of the Gospel and Promoting Christian Knowledge) and those endeavours upon the spot, of which it is the object to supply our destitute settlements. I am disposed also to think, and I shall take occasion, from our meeting, to follow up the suggestion, that we might, with much advantage, establish in this Diocese, a Church Society, similar to that which has been framed under the auspices of an able and zealous Bishop, in the neighbouring Diocese of Nova Scotia.

<sup>1</sup> Heber.

In seeking to recommend the Church, according to our bounden duty, in the eyes of our own people or of others, and to give the fullest effect to the beautiful offices of her Liturgy, there is a principle to be observed of which I have taken notice upon former occasions in addressing my brethren in a different capacity, but which I am prompted briefly to touch upon, because it is in danger from local circumstances, of partially falling into disregard—I mean the principle of rendering the services of the Church more impressive by the manner of performing them, and by the exterior reverence and decorum with which they are clothed. The preface to the Common Prayer Book, the Canons and the Rubrics, more particularly in the Communion office<sup>1</sup>, afford sufficient evidence of the care which was wisely taken by our holy Reformers, while they purged away from our worship the cumbrous pageantry of superstition, to preserve the utmost gravity, solemnity, and order in the public ministrations of the Church; and to shed over them a venerable air fitted to remind men of the awe with which they should approach the things of God. The forms and ceremonies of the Church, the prescribed postures of worship, the habits of those who officiate, the vessels of the Sanctuary, the several appendages and distinctions of our National Churches, are all designed to aid in this effect; and, as servants of the Church, we ought to act in the spirit, and, wherever we can, according to the letter of her regulations.

<sup>1</sup> See Note G.

The disuse upon the ordinary occasions of life, of a distinguishing ecclesiastical dress, is a departure from wise and venerable rules<sup>1</sup>, from which our Clergy ought never to take licence to depart farther than, according to the now received usage, they are obliged to do. They should *never* betray a disposition to *secularize* the character and office which they hold. And in the actual performance of any ecclesiastical function, no deviation can be justified for which the plea of necessity cannot be advanced. No needless irregularity should be suffered to creep into our performance of official duty which may settle by degrees into a precedent.

To pass, however, to considerations of a higher nature,—I would observe that among very many disadvantages attaching to our situation as a Colonial branch of the Church, we have our advantages too; and it is not the least of these that in many parts of the Diocese, we are less trammelled by circumstances in making an approach to that holy discipline, the restoration of which, according to the language of the Church herself, is “much to be wished<sup>2</sup>.” The existence of any such advantage ought to be turned to the utmost account. Instances have not been wanting in this Diocese in which communicants who have given scandal by some irregularity, have made public reparation to the assembled company of worshippers; and I cannot but commend the endeavour, which has been used with success by some of our

<sup>1</sup> See Note H.

<sup>2</sup> Communion Office.

Clergy, to revive the practice enjoined in the prayer-book, that persons desirous of presenting themselves at the Lord's Supper, at least unless they are accepted and constant communicants, should intimate their purpose beforehand to their pastor.

I could enlarge upon this topic, and there are others which I could wish to notice, particularly the encouragement and the direction of Sunday Schools, were it not time that (if I may borrow the allusion,) I should draw in my sails and make for the shore<sup>1</sup>. I will only say, then, in conclusion, that if, as I have intimated in the course of these observations, we stand as a distinct and *peculiar* body, in virtue of our being a branch of the Episcopal Church, this is not the highest or the most important *peculiarity* by which we should be marked. Our distinction as Episcopalians will very little avail us, unless we take heed that we are not behind others in the genuine characteristics of the people of God ; a *PECULIAR people*, in the language of one Apostle, *zealous of good works* — *a chosen generation* ; according to the description of another, *a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a PECULIAR people, who show forth the praises of Him who hath called us out of darkness into his marvellous light*. This is the mark which we should set before our followers, and to the attainment of which we should seek to lead them on. We should keep clear and conspicuously bright the lamp of Holy Truth, which,

<sup>1</sup> ——— extremo ni jam sub fine laborum

Vela traham, et terris festinem advertere proram.—*Virg.*

as the Priests of the Temple, we are appointed to watch ; holding forth constantly to view (for this is the life and light of the Church, and in exact proportion as it is obscured, our Ministry fails of its purpose,) the salvation of sinners through the free Grace of God in Christ Jesus. We should magnify the love which was displayed in the rescue of a guilty race, and in the gift of the Spirit of Holiness : we should press these things home to the bosoms of our hearers, and teach men to make them their own :— we should labour night and day to awaken those who are plunged in the sleep of sin, and to dissipate the dreams of those who smooth over the Doctrines of the Cross, and are satisfied in conscience, because they satisfy the nominally Christian world: we should regard it as the business of our lives to be instrumental in *turning men from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God*. And even if it were to please God that we could turn but one, shall we not think the labour of our lives to have been better spent than in the pursuit, however successful, of any worldly object, when we remember, for our encouragement, the value of one immortal soul, as set forth in the declaration of Him who paid its ransom—that there is JOY IN THE PRESENCE OF THE ANGELS OF GOD OVER ONE SINNER THAT REPENTETH ?

## NOTES.

---

NOTE A. p. 12.—I see no reason, however, why I should be withheld from giving renewed publicity to the testimony rendered by the late Bishop Stewart to his predecessor, Bishop Mountain, the first Protestant Bishop of Quebec (the person to whom the allusion is here made). It will be seen that I have followed his own example in the tribute which I have paid to him, it being from his first Charge to the Clergy that this passage is extracted. His own humility of spirit, considering the character which at the time he had already established for sanctity and devotedness, and the value of his previous services in the Canadas, are strikingly exhibited in the close of the extract.

“The subject,” he says, “which first presses itself on your feelings and mine, is that of mutual condolence on the loss we have all sustained in the death of our dear and excellent friend and counsellor, the late Bishop of this diocese. We all recollect with lively remembrance, the virtues and piety of his character, and the learning and abilities which distinguished him; and with sorrow and sympathy we reflect on our being deprived of his example and guidance. This affectionate remembrance, and these just reflections, will always stimulate us, I trust, to greater watchfulness, diligence, and exertions in the performance of our respective duties; but they add to my concern on your account, and to my anxiety on my own. They make me more sensible

of my inferiority in many respects, and my comparative unfitness for so great a charge and so responsible an office. The plainness of this call to humility on my part, and my improvement of it, may be of advantage to me, but cannot be beneficial to you, except in the occasion it affords, and which I beg you will use, of exercising greater charity and candour towards me."

Again, in the close of the Charge, he says, "We cannot separate on this solemn occasion, without looking back to the loss this Diocese has sustained in the death of the late Bishop. We have condoled with you on the death of our excellent friend and counsellor; we have reflected on the greatness of my responsibility and charge, and the increased measure of patience, brotherly kindness, and charity, desired by me from you, on my succession to such a predecessor. \* \* \* \* \*

\* \* \* By the memory of him over whom we have mourned—though dead, may he live in our hearts!—by the value of souls, immortal souls, committed to our care; by our love of the Church, *the Church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood*, I beseech your aid and counsel, I beg your prayers," &c. &c.

NOTE B. p. 14.—As it is possible that many of the individuals into whose hands this Charge may fall, may be little aware of the facts to which reference is here made, it may be encouraging to them to state some particular examples:—

"*London*.—The Bishop of London has consecrated in this Diocese since 1828, sixty new Churches. His Lordship, as Bishop of Chester, to which Diocese he was appointed in 1824, had consecrated twenty-seven, in all eighty-seven Churches.

"*Winchester*.—The number of Churches consecrated in this Diocese within the last ten years, is fifty-nine, and between two and three hundred more have been enlarged and improved.

"*Chester*.—The number of Churches consecrated in this Diocese by the present Bishop during ten years is one hundred and three: Churches now building in the Diocese, thirty-five: Chapels not

consecrated, but having their own Ministers, twenty."—*Eccles. Gazette, for February, 1839.*

If my recollection does not deceive me, there are now thirteen places of worship of the Established Church, of which two were originally dissenting meeting-houses, in the single parish of Lambeth, where, when the present Rector took possession, there was only the parish Church (the private Chapel of the Archbishop not being reckoned). All over England, additional Churches and Chapels of the Establishment are springing up; and other instances are not wanting of the same transfer of meeting-houses to the Church, which has been just mentioned as having taken place at Lambeth. The augmentation and renovation of Churches is also proceeding every where with the same spirit; and it is a gratifying feature in all these undertakings, that one grand object kept in view is to provide free sittings for the poor.

Three new Churches have recently been consecrated in the parish of Stepney, which now contains five spacious Churches, with three thousand free sittings.

We hear a great deal of the alarm conceived, and not without reason, at the multiplication of places of worship and religious institutions at home, in connexion with the Church of Rome, and of the towering anticipations of that Church respecting the recovery of her dominion in the country. But let us thankfully bear in mind the far greater multiplication of our own Churches; and through whatever struggles we may have to pass, let us not despair of our cause,—the cause of Scripture and of truth. The cause of our true Protestantism is the cause of God himself; and it will be seen in the end, what will become of all human devices in religion :—

———— *res Romana PERITURAQUE REGNA.*

NOTE C. p. 14.—Although in proportion to the wealth of the English people, if it could be hoped that all who conform to the Church would have a sense of their duty in this point, it is still little that is done, yet every day affords some examples which



remind us of the exclamation of David, *Who am I, and what is my people, that we should be able to offer so willingly after this sort? for all things come of thee, and of thine own have we given thee.* Many have nobly responded to the call of the present Bishop of London for the erection of additional Churches in the metropolis. Many have given their hundreds, and not a few their thousands. The example has been followed in other Dioceses; associations for the extension of Church accommodation have received the most liberal support, and individuals have come forward in the same spirit. The following specimens are taken almost at random from a *single number of the Ecclesiastical Gazette* :—

“ The Bishop of Ripon has recently consecrated three new Churches in the Archdeaconry of Craven, Lothersdale, Stoneyhurst Green, and Settle. \* \* \* We cannot omit to notice the munificent gift of 1,000*l.* from the Reverend Walter Levitt, the Vicar of Carlton, towards the endowment of the Church [at Lothersdale]. \* \* \* \* \*

“ A public meeting was held at Chelmsford, October 23rd, for the purpose of forming an Essex Association, in aid of the Incorporated Society for building and enlarging Churches and Chapels. It was originally suggested by the Lord Bishop of the Diocese. The subscription is already a munificent one, amounting to nearly 2,000*l.* \* \* \* \* \*

“ On the 1st of November, in the township of Clayton-le-Moors, was laid the foundation-stone of a new Church. \* \* \* The site was the gift of John Fort, Esq. of Read Hall, M. P., who has also granted a site for a Parsonage-house and a National School. The estimated expense of erection is 1,700*l.*; endowment, 2,000*l.*; total, 3,700*l.*; of which sum 500*l.* were subscribed by John Fort, Esq.; 1,000*l.* towards the building, and 1,000*l.* towards the endowment, were the munificent donations of his sister, Ann Fort. \* \* \* \* \*

“ Lord Braybrooke has given the sum of 100*l.* towards building and endowing a Church at Knowle Hill, Berks. \* \* \*

“ Mr. Gladstone, a Liverpool merchant, has contributed the

sum of 4,000*l.* towards the erection of a Church, besides endowing it with a perpetual annuity of 50*l.* towards the maintenance of a Minister. \* \* \* \*

“ Earl Fitzwilliam has given the sum of 1,000*l.* towards affording additional Church accommodation at Malton. \* \*

“ Lord Ward has subscribed 200*l.* to the Worcestershire Diocesan Church Building Society, and 300*l.* to that of Lichfield. His Lordship will also erect parsonage-houses at Netherton and at Cosely, at his own expense. \* \* \* \*

“ At a public meeting at Birmingham, November 27th, the Bishop of Worcester in the chair, a Society was formed, called the *Birmingham Church-building Society*, to supply the appalling deficiency of Church accommodation in that town. \* \* \* The Society proposes to provide, within five years, ten additional Churches. \* \* \* \*

“ On the 28th November, the new Church of St. George's, Egbaston, was consecrated by the Bishop of Worcester. The ground on which it stands is the liberal gift of Lord Calthorpe, who has endowed the Church, and contributed the greater portion of the funds (between 5,000*l.* and 6,000*l.*) required for its erection. \* \* \* \*

“ The Countess of Bridgewater has given 500*l.* towards the fund for erecting additional Churches and Parsonage-houses in the Diocese of Lichfield. \* \* \* \*

“ On Sunday last, a new Church, erected by Mr. James Brook, of Thornton Lodge, near Huddersfield, for the accommodation of the inhabitants of Meltham Mills in the employ of Messrs. Jonas Brook and Brothers, was opened by licence from the Bishop of the Diocese. \* \* \* It will seat about two hundred and fifty persons ; and adjoining it is a School, which, by means of sliding shutters, may be thrown open and form part of the Church. The School-room is calculated to hold about six hundred children. At the other end of the School there are two dwelling-houses, one for the Clergyman, and the other for the School-master. The whole of the edifice, we are told, is erected at an expense of not less than 4,000*l.* A truly Christian example is here set for the

opulent manufacturers in the country to provide for the spiritual wants of those who are in their daily employ."—*Ecclesiastical Gazette for December, 1838.*

The Dowager Queen Adelaide is building a Church at Malta, for the English residents, estimated at 7,000*l.* or 8,000*l.*, at her own expense.

The Bishop of Lincoln gave 800*l.* the other day towards the erection of a Church at Holbeach.

It has been ascertained that the late Bishop of Durham (Van Mildert) spent 10,000*l.* a year upon charitable and religious objects, being one half of his income. This was not suspected during his life. His predecessor (Barrington) is known to have passed, I think, 100,000*l.* for such purposes, during his occupation of the See, through the hands of Mr. Butler, his London agent. Other Bishops of Durham have been great public benefactors : witness the institution founded by Lord Crewe, in Bamborough Castle, for the relief of shipwrecked persons, and other charitable ends.

Durham was (till the late division of its revenues) the richest See in England, and has been set up as a target upon which the enemies of the Church have emptied their quivers ; but in the party cry which is raised in this country, as well as at home, against the incomes of the English Bishops, it is forgotten what use they make of their incomes ; it is forgotten to what expenses they are unavoidably subjected in the maintenance of their stations, as heads of the Church Establishment of a mighty empire and members (as is fitting in a Christian country) of the high council of the realm ; it is forgotten that, *these circumstances considered*, many of the Bishoprics are *exceedingly poor* : it is forgotten to form a *comparative* estimate of their wealth with reference to the scale of English opulence in the higher classes of society ; it is forgotten that there are *single individuals* in England whose incomes *exceed the whole aggregate amount of those of the Archbishops, and all the Bishops together.*

NORR D. p. 20.—In reflecting upon what I have here said, I have partaken of that anxiety which was felt by the great Hooker, when he had declared, and having been attacked for the declaration, was defending his confident and comfortable belief, “that God was merciful to save thousands of our fathers, living in Popish superstitions, inasmuch as they sinned ignorantly.” He appears to have been afraid that some persons might pervert this charitable hope to their own damage and that of the Church ; so interpreting it as to lower the necessity of a discerning faith in Christ, to think much too lightly of the risk of conformity to a system which is not simply marked by deviations from the word of God, but is prophetically denounced in that word, and to accommodate the way of salvation by a perilous easiness, to human expectations.

Having habitually regarded the case of the Roman Catholics in this country, in the mass, as very nearly approaching to that of “our fathers” before the Reformation as viewed by Hooker, because it has not pleased God that any effectual means should yet exist to carry on the work of reformation among them ; having seen how utterly abortive some attempts of this nature have proved, and being strongly inclined to believe that their day is not yet come, I have been apprehensive that in *giving utterance* to these sentiments, however I may have sought to guard against such an effect, I may have opened a door to such prejudicial inferences, in certain minds, as I have stated above.

As far therefore as concerns persons so minded, I would avail myself of the language of Hooker, to warn them of their danger : in handling the salvability of the Romanist and maintaining the affirmative of the question, he says that he has therein “walked, as with reverence, so with fear ; with reverence, in regard to our fathers, which lived in former times ; not without fear, considering them that are alive.

“I wish from mine heart,” he continues, “their conversion, whosoever are thus perversely affected. For I must needs say, their case is fearful, their estate dangerous, which harden them-

selves, presuming on the mercy of God towards others. It is true that God is merciful, but let us beware of presumptuous sins. God delivered Jonah from the bottom of the sea ; will you therefore cast yourselves headlong from the tops of rocks, and say in your heart, God shall deliver us ? He pitieth the blind that would gladly see ; but will He pity him that may see, and hardeneth himself in blindness ? No. Christ hath spoken too much unto you, to claim the privilege of your fathers."

But as far as concerns the hope indulged for those who are in error, by that holy and heavenly-minded man and thoroughly-enlightened Protestant, I can form no better wish than that all Protestants should have the same charitable temper coupled with the same clearness of judgment ; and I cannot forbear from a few extracts which afford specimens of both.

Desirous of affording to " our fathers " the benefit of an ambiguity in the word *meriting*, which is used by the ancients and by some foreign reformers, in the sense of *obtaining*, he says, " Forasmuch as their meaning is doubtful, and charity doth always interpret doubtful things favourably, what should induce us to think that rather the damage of the worst construction did light upon them all, than that the blessing of the better was granted to thousands ?"

He proves by quotations from some eminent Reformers and sufficiently severe antagonists of the Papal system, that it was not the principle of the Reformation to deny the Church of Rome to be a part, however diseased, of the Church of Christ, or to impute to her the rejection of the fundamentals of Christianity. His quotations are, in part, as follows :—

" I suppose," saith one, " that in the Papacy some Church remaineth : Church crazed, or if you will, quite broken to pieces, yet some Church." " I deny her not the name of a Church," saith another, " no more than to a man the name of a man, so long as he liveth, what sickness soever he hath." A third hath these words, after some expressions of strong reprobation, " Every man seeth, except he willingly hood-wink himself, that as always, so now, the Church of Rome holdeth firmly and stedfastly the doc-

trine of Truth concerning Christ ; and baptizeth in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost ; confesseth and avoucheth Christ to be the only Redeemer of the world, and the Judge that shall sit upon quick and dead, receiving true believers into endless joy, faithless and godless men being cast with Satan and his angels into flames unquenchable."

Some objections, relating to the Doctrine of Works, he discusses at length, touching particularly on Gal. v. 2. and in the course of his argument speaks thus :—" Works are an addition : be it so, what then ? The foundation is not subverted by every kind of addition. Simply to add unto those fundamental words is not to mingle wine with water, heaven and earth, things polluted with the sanctified blood of Christ. Of which crime indict them which attribute those operations, in whole or in part, to any creature, which in the work of our salvation wholly are peculiar unto Christ ; and if I open my mouth to speak in their defence ; if I hold my peace, and plead not against them as long as breath is within my body, let me be guilty of all the dishonour that ever hath been done to the Son of God. But the more dreadful a thing it is to deny salvation by Christ alone, the more slow and fearful I am, except it be too manifest, to lay a thing so grievous to any man's charge. Let us beware, lest, if we make too many ways of denying Christ, we scarce leave any way for ourselves truly and soundly to confess Him. Salvation only by Christ is the true foundation whereupon indeed Christianity standeth. But what if I say, you cannot be saved only by Christ, without this addition, Christ believed in heart, confessed with mouth, obeyed in life and conversation ? Because I add, do I therefore deny that which I did directly affirm ? There may be an additament of explication, which overthroweth not, but proveth and concludeth the proposition, whereunto it is annexed." \* \* \*

" Offer them the very fundamental words, and what man is there that will refuse to subscribe unto them ? Can they directly grant, and directly deny, one and the very selfsame thing ? Our own proceedings in disputing against their works satisfactory and meritorious, do show, not only that they hold, but that we

acknowledge them to hold the foundation, notwithstanding their opinion. For are not *these* our arguments against them ? Christ alone hath satisfied and appeased his Father's wrath ; Christ hath merited salvation alone. We should do fondly to use such disputes, neither could we think to prevail by them, if that whereupon we ground, were a thing which we know they do not hold, which we are assured they will not grant. Their very answers to all such reasons, as are in this controversy brought against them, will not permit us to doubt, whether they hold the foundation or no. Can any man, that has read their books concerning this matter, be ignorant, how they draw all their answers unto *these* heads,—that the remission of all our sins, the pardon of all whatsoever punishments thereby deserved, the rewards which God hath laid up in Heaven, are by the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ purchased, and obtained sufficiently for all men ; but for no man effectually for his benefit in particular, except the blood of Christ be applied particularly to him by such means as God hath appointed that to work by ? That those means of themselves, being but dead things, only the blood of Christ is that which putteth life, force, and efficacy in them to work, and to be available, each in his kind, to our salvation ? Finally, that grace being purchased for us by the blood of Christ, and freely without any merit or desert at the first bestowed upon us, the good things which we do, after grace received, be thereby not made satisfactory and meritorious ? Some of their sentences to this effect I must allege for mine own warrant. He then gives some extracts from the writers of the Romish Church, pointedly to the effect of what he had just attributed to them. \* \* \*

\* \* \* Howbeit," he says farther on, " considering how many virtuous and just men, how many Saints, how many Martyrs, how many of the Ancient Fathers of the Church, have had their sundry perilous opinions ; and amongst sundry of their opinions this,—that they hoped to make God some part of amends for their sins by the voluntary punishment which they laid upon themselves,—because *by a consequent* it may follow hereupon that they were injurious unto Christ, shall we therefore make

such deadly epitaphs, and set them upon their graves, they denied the foundation of Faith directly, they are damned, there is no salvation for them? Saint Austin saith of himself, *Errare possum, Hæreticus esse nolo*. And, except we put a difference between them that err, and them that obstinately persist in error, how is it possible that ever any man should hope to be saved?

\* \* \* \* \*

“And shall I think, because of this only error, that such a man toucheth not so much as the hem of Christ’s garment? If he do, wherefore should not I have hope, that virtue might proceed from Christ to save him? Because his error doth *by consequent* overthrow his faith, shall I therefore cast him off, as one that hath utterly cast off Christ? One that holdeth not so much as by a single thread?

\* \* \* \*

“Surely, I must confess unto you, if it be an error, that God may be merciful to save men even when they err, my greatest comfort is my error; were it not for the love I bear unto this error, I would never wish to speak, nor to live.

\* \*

“Wherefore to resume that mother sentence, whereof I little thought that so much trouble would have grown, ‘I doubt not but God was merciful to save thousands of our fathers, living in Popish superstitions, inasmuch as they sinned ignorantly.’ Alas! what bloody matter is there contained in this sentence, that it should be an occasion of so many hard censures? Did I say, that thousands of our fathers might be saved? I have showed which way it cannot be denied. Did I say, I doubt not but that they were saved? I see no impiety in this persuasion, though I had no reason for it. Did I say, their ignorance did make me hope they did find mercy and so were saved? What hindereth salvation but sin? Sins are not equal; and ignorance, though it doth not make sin to be no sin, yet seeing it did make their sin the less, why should it not make our hope concerning their life the greater? We pity the most, and doubt not but God hath most compassion over them that sin for want of understanding.

\* \* \*

If I have been deceived on this point, the blessed Apostle hath deceived me. What I said of others,



the same he said of himself, 'I obtained mercy, for I did it ignorantly.' Construe his words, and you cannot misconstrue mine. I speak no otherwise, I mean no otherwise than he did."

He winds up the whole argument by a salutary caution, that it is "a great deal meet for us to have regard to our own estate, than to sift over-curiously what is become of other men. And fearing, lest that such questions as these, if voluntarily they should be too far waded in, might seem worthy of that rebuke which our Saviour thought needful in a case not unlike, *What is this unto thee*<sup>1</sup>?"

If, however, there are any who go so far as to think that a hope entertained for the disciples of Rome is an evidence of dangerously defective views in religion in the person himself who entertains it, the single case of Hooker is surely sufficient to disprove such a notion. *Hope* for other men may, I believe, be still *farther* extended without prejudice to sound Protestantism, or to those views of our Salvation, which give all the honour to the blessed Saviour of sinners. Will any man attribute a laxity upon those points to the author of the *Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul*? Yet in his Family Expositor, (in a note upon 1 John ii. 2.) speaking of the Salvability of virtuous Heathens through Christ, he says, "I do not see that Christianity can receive any prejudice by our acknowledging that if there are those in whom a truly virtuous temper prevails, they may be accepted of God, in consideration of the atonement which Christ hath made." A truly virtuous temper must be an evidence of some measure of grace given.

But to return to the case of the Romanist, can any man deliberately think that there are not evidences of grace and of a saving faith in Christ implanted in the heart, in such men as the

<sup>1</sup> The foregoing extracts from Hooker are taken from his Discourse on Justification. I had made them larger, and have found it difficult to retrench them, but I did not wish to load these notes to excess. Those who have access to his works, and to whom the Discourse above mentioned is new, will be well repaid by the perusal of it, although possibly they may not agree in all points with the views of the writer.

author of the *Imitation of Christ*<sup>1</sup>, or as Fenelon, or as Pascal ? If these evidences are mixed with matter which seems by logical inference to contradict them, we must remember that it is never fair in *judging of men*, although it may be perfectly proper in *reasoning with them*, to insist upon fastening consequences upon them, as flowing from their system, which consequences they reject and disclaim, and thus to deny to them the benefit of their inconsistency.

I believe that the view which I have here taken, is agreeable to the word of God, and that those who are the *sufferers* by corruptions introduced into their Church, are not to be confounded with the *authors* or *interested lovers* of those corruptions, against whom the judgments of Scripture are denounced. The case of a devout and sincere Romanist appears to me to be provided for, if I may so express it, in 1 Cor. iii. 11—15. upon which text Archbishop Tillotson has a sermon “on the hazard of being saved in the Church of Rome.”

And now a few more words as to “the part which we feel called upon to take with reference to the professors of the Roman Catholic Religion” in Lower Canada (a question which must be affected by “the judgment which we pronounce” upon them). In my own view of the case, we are more likely to be called upon to *suffer* than to *do*, in testifying to that body, by any general or extensive proceeding, in the cause of spiritual truth. But some of our obligations having, as I apprehend, been misconceived in a manner calculated to embarrass the consciences of the Clergy, and this having spread I know not to what precise extent, I feel it incumbent upon me, (for now that I am embarked in the subject, I will go through with it,) very briefly to set them, as far as God shall enable me, in a correct light.

1. It has been supposed that the Ordination-vows of the Clergy distinctly oblige them to engage in perpetual controversy with the Romish Church in this country, and to labour in the work of proselytism among her disciples.

<sup>1</sup> Commonly reputed to be Thomas à Kempis.

<sup>2</sup> Charge, p. 20.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

It is certainly (as I have intimated) the duty of Clergy and Laity alike, to avail themselves of all well-chosen opportunities and all promising openings, for endeavouring to communicate to those who do not enjoy the blessing, a knowledge of pure and scriptural truth. And they should watch for such opportunities, and, if they are permitted, should *make* them. But with reference to that particular and special cure *of souls* which is formally confided, in the solemnities of Ordination, to the Clergy, and to which their vows respecting pastoral instruction exclusively refer, it does not, in this country, comprehend the members of the Church of Rome. In England and Ireland, where the entire face of the country is divided into parishes of the established Church; where the Churches formerly belonging to the Church of Rome have been transferred to our own, and where the proprietors of the population at large are subject to payments for the support of the latter, all the inhabitants of a parish are the *Parishioners* of a Clergyman. It is not so here. In Upper Canada, even the Rectors do not stand in the same relation to other religious bodies which the Rectors do at home. There is no *official connection* between them. In Lower Canada, where Parish Churches and tithes are in the hands of Roman Catholics, and secured to them by law, the appointments received by our Clergy do not impose any specific obligation, nor convey any kind of authority, with respect to the religious instruction of such persons.

2. It has been supposed that the 66th Canon, which relates to Popish Recusants, imposes a duty of the same kind. But that Canon refers to a state of society, and describes a class of persons, both of which have long ceased to exist. *Recusants* were persons who refused conformity to the established Religion of the country, at a time when, the principles of the toleration not being understood, the whole population were by law compellable, under severe penalties, to conform. The Canons of 1603 are still binding, so far as they are now practicable and consistent with the subsequent sanctions of authority; but it must be manifest, even upon a slight inspection of them, that in other points they are obsolete, and have been virtually revoked.

I shall not notice an argument which has been drawn from the commission given by Christ to his Church at large, to preach the Gospel to *every creature*, farther than to point out that this direction to propagate the faith throughout the world, cannot be understood as if every Clergyman were charged with the direct religious instruction of every individual with whom he comes in contact in life. For in how many instances would this be *casting pearls to swine!* and in how many more would it be obstructing, by ill-advised or premature interference, the cause which it would be designed to promote !

Let me not be here thought to repress, or to do otherwise than honour and encourage that zeal which would be *instant in season and out of season*. But if we are to do any thing in this particular behalf, let the *grounds upon which* we are to do it, be first *correctly stated*. In musing upon the subject, I have been more moved to hope for our one day creating a favourable impression upon the Romanists of this country, (if we go wisely to work,) by the single consideration of Deut. vii. 17, 18, than by all the arguments which I have ever heard in recommendation of our taking the field.

Whenever and wherever we do so, I hope it will be more in the spirit of Bishop Hopkins, of Vermont<sup>1</sup>, than of some other Protestant champions among our neighbours in the United States, who would do well to remember the saying of a very early Christian father<sup>2</sup>:—

Θράσος καὶ ἀνθάρεια καὶ τόλμα τοῖς κατηραμένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐπιείκεια καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνη, καὶ πραΰτης παρὰ τοῖς ἐνλογημένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

In modern times, and with reference to *intercourse* with Roman Catholics, we have an admirable example in the interesting Memoirs of Felix Neff.

“The broad distinctions and uncompromising truths of Pro-

<sup>1</sup> In his work, *The Church of Rome in her primitive purity, compared with the Church of Rome at the present day*. I think, however, that he has made some unwarranted concessions.

<sup>2</sup> Clemens Romanus, in his first Epistle to the Corinthians.

testantism were matters of awful sanctity with Neff; and yet though he was the Pastor of a flock opposed to Popery by all the strong prejudices of hereditary separation, I might almost say of deep-rooted aversion, with dogmatical and polemical Protestantism he would have nothing to do. He made numberless converts from Romanism, not so much by argument and discussion as by widely inculcating the true spirit of the Gospel; not by dwelling on topics of strife or points of difference, but on points of universal agreement and by exhibiting our common Christianity in its most persuasive form, until their hearts melted before the one Mediator and Intercessor, and they said, Your God shall be our God, and your creed shall be our creed."—*Memoir of Felix Neff, Pastor of the High Alps, by the Rev. W. S. Gilly, D. D.*

"When Neff was in France, he accidentally found himself in the company of a Roman Catholic Curé, who did not know him. Their route lay towards the same place, and as they journeyed together, the conversation took a religious turn. Our pastor, with his usual good sense and right feeling, spoke fervently on the faith and duties of a Minister of the Gospel, but he did not drop a single word which could offend the prejudices or rouse the suspicion of his companion, who was gradually moved to take a deep interest in the new views of a spiritual life which were opened before him. They came to a Roman Catholic Church, and the Curé invited his unknown counsellor to enter the sanctuary and to implore God's blessing on their conversation. Neff readily complied, they breathed their silent prayers before the altar [the Protestant Minister here, however, went a great length], and they parted without the Curé being aware of any difference in their religious opinions. I perceived, said Neff, when he related this anecdote, that the Priest's heart was touched, and I did not disturb the pious feelings of the moment by avowing myself, or by attempting to square his religious sentiments with my own."—*Ibid.*

NOTE E. p. 26.—In the letters which passed between Pierre du Moulin, a very eminent foreign Protestant, and the admirable Bishop Andrews, there is a curious example of that infirmity (and we ought all to guard against it, on whatever side of a question), by which good men find a difficulty in conceding what makes against their own party; and if they have been drawn by the force of fair inference acting upon their minds, beyond the mark which suits them, will seek sometimes, although they are imposing upon their own judgments, to retire within it again.

Dumoulin intreats the Bishop to intercede for him with King James of England, on account of his supposed want of respect for Episcopacy, which he disclaims in these words:—Non sum tam fastidiosè arrogans ut velim me opponere toti antiquitati; et rem quæ jam inde à *seculo Apostolis proximo* recepta fuit in Ecclesiâ, ut vitiosam aut improbam aspernari.

The Bishop re-assures him with respect to the royal displeasure, and then notices a circumstance which seemed to furnish evidence of his going yet further, in his secret judgment, in favour of Episcopacy, than he was willing to allow: Ego verò libens agnosco æquiores te in res nostras, plerisque vestrùm; quantò magis antiquitatem versas, tanto æquiores: addo et æquiores adhuc multo futurum, si te sineret Ecclesia vestra; utinam autem sineret!—Illa, ut videtur, personarum vitia ad res transtulit, rerumque adeò legitimum usum, propter abusum sustulit paulatim hoc à vobis dedocenda. Cui dum tu morem gerere vis, morem ipse animo tuo non geris. Nam de *animo* tuo ex *calamo* conjecturam facio. Adeò enim in nos propensus calamus tuus, ut scripserit (crede autem te non invito) nostrum Episcoporum ordinem rem esse receptam in Ecclesiâ inde à *seculo Apostolorum*. Rectè autem hoc scripserat calamus: id tu *liturâ scilicet induxisti* (nempe rō APOSTOLORUM) ac vicem ejus APOSTOLIS PROXIMO reposuisti<sup>1</sup>.

The Bishop adds, a little farther on, Totam antiquitatem à nobis esse, nec ipse negas: an verò Ecclesiæ jam ulli plus deferendum

<sup>1</sup> Clarorum virorum Epistolæ, Collectore Paulo Colomesio. Lond. 1687.

quàm antiquitati toti, ipse videris. This is the right way of stating the question ; and thus the other party, even after shifting a little from his original position (as taken by his *pen*), left the vantage-ground to the cause of Episcopacy. It is this ground which is taken by Chillingworth, in his *Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy demonstrated*, and he reduces the whole argument to a syllogism. That which *fixes* the *sense* of Scripture in those passages which are favourable to our claims, and proves what was the proceeding of the Apostles, in the absence of positive institution in the Word of God, is a comparison with the early, universal, and continued practice of the Church. The case is the same as that of the sanctification of the first day of the week.

What an incalculable advantage would it be to the cause of Protestants, and what sacrifices ought ALL Protestant parties to be ready to make for the sake of gaining it, if a *comprehension* could be effected in which they would stand, as one body, occupying a ground respecting their Orders which could not be challenged by the Romanist himself, if well-informed. With respect to the Episcopal Churches, this is the fact. Witness the *Défense de la validité des Ordinations Anglicanes*, by le Père Courayer, whose grave-stone may be seen in the solemn cloisters of Westminster Abbey. Although the man was, in the end, persecuted, his proofs can never be shaken.

NOTE F. p. 27.—The following extracts from the correspondence of the late Bishop Heber, will be interesting to those to whom they may happen to be new :—

“ He too [Mar Simeon, Episcopal Commissary from the Archbishop of Shiranz], as well as Mar Abraham and the Archbishop Athanasius, expressed a desire to attend the English Church Service, and accordingly came the day on which I administered Confirmation. On the whole I cannot but hope that many good effects may arise from this approximation in courtesy of the Eastern Churches to our own ; when they find that we desire no dominion over them, they may gradually be led to imitate us.”

“ I believe I mentioned to your Grace in my last letter, the sort of amicable intercourse which I had maintained with different sects of Oriental Christians, and particularly with some Bishops of the Armenian Church. One of these, whom I had previously met at Dacca, Mar Abraham, a Suffragan dependent on the Patriarch of Jerusalem, was much with me, and still more, I think, at Bishop's College, during my late residence at Calcutta. He, like the Syrian Metropolitan, attended service in the Cathedral, and I was happy to be able, on different occasions, to treat him with respect and hospitality. His sect (I need not inform your Grace) is Monophysite, and the Liturgy of his Church grievously crowded with superstitious observances, approaching to those of the Roman ritual. *They disclaim, however, earnestly, the Pope and some of the distinguished tenets of Popery*, and both my friend Mar Abraham, and some others of his nation, express a great admiration of our Liturgy, and a desire (which I think claims all the encouragement in our power) to draw near us, and learn from us. One of their nation, named George Avdal, has offered his services to Bishop's College, to translate our Liturgy into Armenian, to which may be prefixed, if God gives me health and leisure to finish it, a short account which I am drawing up of the foundation, reformation, and history of the English Church, which, I am led to believe, may do us great service among the Eastern Christians, and may be advantageously circulated not only in Armenian, but the other languages of Asia. And, if Mr. Avdal does his work well, I think of employing him still farther in rendering into that language some of the homilies of St. Chrysostom, and of such other Fathers as the Eastern Church hold in most honour, but of whom, except by name, they know nothing. By such means, duly persevered in, and practised with meekness, and without the appearance of dictation or superiority, it may be hoped, under the Divine blessing, that some of the grosser ignorance may be removed, and some of the more crying abuses reformed, which have, for many centuries, overspread the most ancient and illustrious sects of Christianity.”



“ Bishop Abraham evinced, on leaving Calcutta, *his confidence in myself*, and Principal Mill, in a yet more remarkable manner, *in committing to my care for education at Bishop's College, a very pleasing young man, a Deacon of his church*, and related to himself, who had attended him from Palestine. He said that *the Armenian Church felt the want of a more liberal education than they could usually obtain for their Clergy*; that, in particular, a knowledge of the English language and literature would be very valuable to them, and that this young man, who, *having good talents and powerful interest*, was likely to be called, eventually, to a conspicuous station in the church of Jerusalem, was exceedingly anxious to learn any thing which we might have to teach. He professed a willingness to pay, to the best of his power, towards the expense of his remaining with us, but, well knowing his poverty, *I told him that was needless. I have accordingly arranged with the Principal, and College Council, to receive ‘ Mesrop David’* on the same terms of inmate and guest on which Christian David, the Tamul Clergyman, was received on a former occasion. They agreed with me that it was an opportunity not to be lost of improving and extending the influence of our Church among his countrymen, and should the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts object to his being supported at the College expense, *I will most cheerfully take it on myself.*”

“ Athanasius and Abraham, with the titles of Metropolitan and ‘ Ramban,’ or Archdeacon, arrived at Bombay whilst I was there, on their way to the Malayalim Churches, and with regular appointments from the Patriarch, ‘ sitting in the seat of Simon Cephas, which is at Antioch.’ As it has always been my endeavour to conciliate and befriend the Eastern Christians who find their way into India, both I and Archdeacon Barnes showed them all the respect and kindness in our power, and we were on as good terms as people could be, who had no common language, the strangers speaking only Arabic, and all our communication being filtered through an interpreter.

“ They attended Church, unasked, and received the Sacrament at my hands <sup>1</sup>; on which occasion I placed the Metropolitan in my own chair, and we embraced in a most brotherly manner at the church-door after service.”

“ TO MAR ATHANASIOUS.

(As translated into Syriac, by Messrs. Robinson and Mill.)

“ Calcutta, December, 1825.

“ To the excellent and learned father Mar Athanasius, Bishop and Metropolitan of all the Churches of Christ in India, which walk after the rule of the Syrians, Mar Reginald, by the grace of God, Bishop of Calcutta ; grace, mercy, and peace from God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ.”

A correspondence headed in the same oriental style which appears in this last extract, took place in 1616, between Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria. It led to little or nothing ; and so our hopes may end with reference to any approximation in our own day, of more remote Eastern Churches to ours <sup>2</sup>: God knows his own time : but there is so remarkable a parallel in some of the circumstances of the two cases, that it cannot be otherwise than interesting to observe it. The parallel will appear by comparing the passages in *Italics* in the foregoing extracts from Heber, with the parts of those which follow printed in the same character.

Speaking of the persecutions suffered from the Turks, the Patriarch says, in a truly Christian spirit of faith and love, *A quibus etiamsi variis exagitemur exerceamurque modis, nobis tamen pro Christi nomine quem spiramus, cujusque stigmata in corpore circumferimus, ab istiusmodi hominibus perquam volupe est*

<sup>1</sup> This, with the greatest deference be it spoken, may be considered a circumstance of questionable propriety, when reference is had to the state of doctrine and worship in the Church to which these communicants belonged.

<sup>2</sup> There is, however, this great difference in the cases, that our own Ecclesiastical Establishment is planted and spreading upon the spot where our Clergy are brought into contact with those of the Syrian and Armenian Churches.

LONDON:  
GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,  
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

# CHARGE

DELIVERED

TO THE CLERGY

OF THE

DIOCESE OF EXETER

BY THE

RIGHT REVEREND

HENRY, LORD BISHOP OF EXETER,

AT HIS TRIENNIAL VISITATION

IN THE

MONTHS OF AUGUST, SEPTEMBER, AND OCTOBER,

1839.

---

LONDON:

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

1839.



**LONDON :**  
**Printed by WILLIAM CLOWES and SONS,**  
**Stamford Street.**

TO THE  
CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF EXETER,  
**THIS CHARGE,**  
PUBLISHED AT THEIR REQUEST,  
IS DEDICATED  
BY THEIR AFFECTIONATE FRIEND AND BROTHER,  
H. EXETER.



## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

My Clergy must not be considered as having committed themselves to an assent to all that is contained in this Charge, by their request that I would publish it. By reason of its length, some parts were omitted at one or other of the places at which I held my Visitation. Some parts, indeed, were written while I was on my tour; and even at the places at which I last visited—Tiverton, Honiton, and Exeter—one or two long passages were not delivered, particularly much of what relates to Australia, and to the Pamphlet circulated by the “Committee of Privy Council on Education.” Some delay has been caused in the publication by preparing the heads of a Church Discipline Bill, which will be found in Appendix II. 3.





## CONTENTS.

---

	Page
I. The Church in Australia . . . . .	2
II. The Church in Canada . . . . .	14
III. The Government Scheme of Public Education . . . . .	20
IV. Act for abridging Pluralities and enforcing Residence of Clergy . . . . .	54
V. Church Discipline Bill . . . . .	55
VI. Theological Studies—Oxford Tracts . . . . .	58
1. Divine Commission of the Christian Ministry . . . . .	59
2. The Sacraments . . . . .	64
3. Tradition . . . . .	73
4. Errors ascribed to these Writers . . . . .	76
VII. Church Associations . . . . .	85

---

## APPENDIX.

I. Correspondence with Lord John Russell . . . . .	89
II. On Church Discipline Bill . . . . .	96
1. Breviate of a proposed Bill . . . . .	105
2. Protest of Bishop of Exeter against the Bill of the last Session . . . . .	115
3. Correspondence with the Bishop of London . . . . .	121



# C H A R G E,

&c. &c.

---

REVEREND BRETHREN,

---

## ERRATA.

Page 34, lines 24, 26—omit the word *Public*.

port of our national greatness, and the success of  
on which to rear any structure of real improvement,  
whether in Church or State. Our peculiar duties will  
limit our active exertions to the concerns of the Church ;  
for, while we cease not to claim the common rights of  
British subjects, we shall best prove ourselves worthy  
of continuing to enjoy them, by exercising them with a  
sole view to God's honour, and to the advancement of  
his kingdom among men. Political events will in-  
terest us, mainly, as they tend to produce results, whether  
of good or ill, to the cause of true Religion.

In looking, with this object solely in view, to the  
present aspect of political contention, there are two  
particulars which especially challenge our observation,  
—one, which respects the interests of Religion in  
our Colonies,—the other, which hardly less concerns

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

# C H A R G E,

*&c. &c.*

---

REVEREND BRETHREN,

In meeting you again, after an interval of three years, in an age of more than common anxiety to every faithful Minister of Christ and every attached member of the Church, I have the gratifying duty of calling on you to join me in humble and thankful acknowledgment of God's mercy, in hitherto preserving to us those institutions which have been the best support of our national greatness, and the surest foundation on which to rear any structure of real improvement, whether in Church or State. Our peculiar duties will limit our active exertions to the concerns of the Church; for, while we cease not to claim the common rights of British subjects, we shall best prove ourselves worthy of continuing to enjoy them, by exercising them with a sole view to God's honour, and to the advancement of his kingdom among men. Political events will interest us, mainly, as they tend to produce results, whether of good or ill, to the cause of true Religion.

In looking, with this object solely in view, to the present aspect of political contention, there are two particulars which especially challenge our observation,—one, which respects the interests of Religion in our Colonies,—the other, which hardly less concerns

the same interests at home. Both involve the same principle, and tend to similar results: both, in my judgment, demand the vigilant circumspection, and the zealous and energetic, though discreet and temperate, exertions of us the Ministers of God's Holy Word, in appealing to the fidelity of a Christian people, for an effectual resistance to innovations in our national policy, which would level the distinctions between truth and falsehood, even in those matters in which the highest spiritual interests of men are involved.

I begin with what immediately concerns our Brethren in the Colonies.

Within the last few years, a course of policy has been instituted, and pursued, in respect to the Colonies of Great Britain, which is wholly unexampled, not only in our own history, but also, if I mistake not, in the history of any other Christian nation. Not only has equal protection, (for God forbid that we should ever repine at equal *protection*!) but equal encouragement has been given by Government to every description of religious faith, and every denomination of professing Christians, in some of the most important dependencies of the British Crown.

In AUSTRALIA—a region which seems destined by Providence to open a wider field to British enterprise, and to be the future scene of grander results, whether to our honour or our shame, than the last generation would have contemplated as possible,—in Australia, a system has been for some time pursued, which would seem to indicate an utter indifference, on the part of those who dispense the national Treasure, whether truth or falsehood shall characterize the religious creeds of any of the Colonists. The production of a certain sum of money, and the signatures of a certain number of names, are all that is requisite for

obtaining from Government aid in the construction of places of religious worship, and in the payment of religious teachers.

In order that this matter may be fully understood, it is necessary to state, that, until within the last few years, a seventh part of the waste lands in this colony was reserved for the endowment of the Church. In 1829 and 1830 it was directed that a portion of these lands should be sold, or alienated under quit-rents; but the produce of the sales and the quit-rents, reserved, were still to be applied in aid of the Establishment to which they belonged. In 1831, and not before, it was communicated to the Governor of Van Diemen's Land, by the Government at home, that it was not intended to appropriate lands in aid of the Church and schools, but to maintain them out of the ordinary revenue. These new instructions (which, however, did not cancel the appointments formerly made, but still left to the Church the right of retaining property in the waste lands—in particular, the quit-rents—which, though far short of what was originally contemplated by Government, was still by no means inconsiderable\*)—these instructions were, unhappily, the cause, or the occasion, of a very speedy desertion of the Church by the Crown. The charge of supporting the Church, being now cast on the ordinary revenue (though that ordinary revenue received the benefit of the produce of the Church lands), soon afforded a pretext for maintaining, that, as all the colonists of all religious persuasions contributed in equal proportion to the public revenue, it was but just that the establishment of the religion of all should be equally provided for by the public. The Governor of New South Wales, Sir R. Bourke, in a despatch of

\* See Despatch of Lieut.-Gov. Arthur, 26 Jan. 1836, p. 71. (Papers of H. C., 1837. No. 112.)



30th of September, 1833, pressed this consideration strongly on the attention of the English Government. It would be "impossible," he said, "to establish a dominant and endowed Church without much hostility, and great improbability of its becoming permanent; as the inclination of the colonists, *which keeps pace with the spirit of the age*, is decidedly adverse to such an institution." He further gave it as his opinion, that "in *laying the foundation of the Christian Religion*" (such are the words of Sir Richard Bourke) "in this young and rising Colony, by equal encouragement held out to its professors in their several churches, peace, loyalty, and good morals would be alike promoted."

That this reasoning did not convince the minister to whom it was addressed, Mr. Stanley, will not be surprising. It seems to have equally failed with all subsequent Governments, until 30th November, 1835, when a despatch to Sir R. Bourke from Lord Glenelg announced, that "in the general principle upon which his plan was founded, as applicable to New South Wales, Her Majesty's Government entirely concurred."—p. 14.

Meanwhile, a similar correspondence had been passing between Colonel Arthur, Lieut.-Governor of the kindred and neighbouring colony of Van Diemen's Land, and the Government at home; but conducted in a very different spirit. Colonel Arthur, though certainly very liberal, fell in this respect far short of Sir R. Bourke. He avowed himself to "*incline strongly in favour of the Established Church, notwithstanding its imperfections in some particulars*, into which I need not (he says) now enter"—and he gave a proof of his preference by "*bringing up his own family in connexion with that communion.*"—p. 71.

This, I submit, is not the language of a bigoted Churchman. Still he professed, as we see, a strong inclination in favour of the Church ; and, so far, he probably was thought less worthy of attention than Sir R. Bourke, who, in all his numerous and voluminous despatches, so far as I can discover, does not appear in a single instance to indicate the slightest preference of any Church, or any Creed whatever ; the only feeling on this subject expressed by this representative of the Sovereign, in New South Wales, being that of *hostility to an established Church*.

Colonel Arthur was very earnest in pressing on the Government the absolute necessity, for the welfare of the Colony, that the number of clergymen of the Church of England should be enlarged. In a despatch of 14th October, 1833 (nearly the same date as of that which I have cited of Sir R. Bourke), he reminds His Majesty's Government that he "has before *frequently* urged the "necessity" of that measure ; and he entreats that he may be "permitted again to urge the paramount importance of this point. Sir," said he, "I pointed out, "*several years ago*, as forcibly as I had the power to "put it, that penitentiaries, treadwheels, flogging, "chain-gangs, and penal settlements, would all prove "ineffectual, either to prevent or to punish crime, "without religious and moral instruction. *There must be a mind to work upon, or all punishment will be utterly unavailing.*"—p. 61.

In the following year, 15th October, 1834 (p. 63), he renews his representations, in terms so honourable to himself, and so very appropriate to the circumstances of the Colony, that I am not afraid of wearying you by reciting them.

"In several despatches, I have endeavoured to bring "before you, in the strongest possible manner, the

“ necessity which exists, notwithstanding the present  
 “ expense of the Ecclesiastical Establishment, for an  
 “ extension of the number of chaplains ; a subject  
 “ which perhaps I cannot too often advert to ; essential  
 “ as the ministrations of religion are everywhere, but  
 “ more especially where, in addition to the natural  
 “ proneness of the human heart to evil, there is also to  
 “ be combated that moral pollution, which is the neces-  
 “ sary result of the unbridled wickedness in which so  
 “ large a proportion of the population must have rioted  
 “ habitually, before their expatriation, and which it is  
 “ our duty to counteract, by the only means I am aware  
 “ of that have ever yet proved effectual.”

To select all the passages in which Lieut.-Governor Arthur urges the duty of an increase of the Church Establishment on the Government at home, would be to exhibit portions of almost every despatch from him, of which we are in possession. But the question presents itself—What success had these honest, these repeated, these warm remonstrances, on the Government to whom they were addressed ?—It was long before any answer seems to have been given ; and, indeed, the frequent changes in the Colonial Office, which occurred in the interval, will account for much of the delay. At length, on the 31st January, 1836, a permanent Colonial Secretary, Lord Glenelg, informs the Lieutenant-Governor “ that he has had under consideration his several despatches on the subject of the extension of the means “ of religious instruction in Van Diemen’s Land ”—(of which, however, he takes no special notice whatever)—but he adds “ that he had given much attention to the “ same subject as respects New South Wales—where “ he had *precise* information of the relative numbers of “ the different denominations of Christians from Sir R. “ Bourke”—(namely, that “ the members of the Church

“ of England are the most numerous—the Roman Catholics are one-fifth of the whole population—and the members of the Church of Scotland form a smaller proportion).”—P. 3. “ Assuming, however,” says he, “ the general similarity, in this respect, of the two Colonies, the documents which I now transmit to you will place you in possession of the principle which Her Majesty’s Government are prepared to sanction in any future law which may be passed by the Legislative Council in the Colony for the appropriation of so much of the Colonial revenue as may be applicable to this general object” (*i. e.* for the support of religion).—p. 65.

Now, what was the principle, *on which alone the Government were prepared to sanction any law passed by the Legislature of Van Diemen’s Land?* The principle which Sir R. Bourke had recommended, that of having no Established Church,—and, in adopting which, Lord Glenelg had expressly said that he did so in deference to the judgment “ of the Governor and the Legislative Council, to whom he committed the task of suggesting and enacting such laws, for the distribution and appropriation of the funds applicable to the general purposes of religion and education.”—p. 14.

But how does this apply to Van Diemen’s Land? I have stated both the judgment and the feelings of the Governor—I will now state those of the Legislature.

In the despatch of Colonel Arthur of 14th October, 1833, he writes that “ *the Legislative Council had advised* the appointment of six new Chaplains”—and on the 16th of May, 1834, he states (p. 62), that the same body had “ *unanimously voted the necessary advances*” for the contemplated building of six Churches—and that there had been expressed the *earnest desire* “ *of the Legislative Council, and of the community generally, for an extension of the Church*

“ *Establishment*, so that the ordinances of religion might  
 “ be placed within the reach of the more remote settlers,  
 “ and also be brought home to the convicts labouring on  
 “ the roads and in the chain-gangs.”—p. 61.

Thus, it appears that the British Government was willing to attend to the judgment and the feelings of a Colonial Legislature and people, if represented to be adverse to a Church Establishment—but decidedly opposed to them, however strongly expressed, when in favour of the Extension of the Church.

Even this is not all: Lieut.-Governor Arthur reminded the Government at home, that there was no longer the same financial objection to this great measure which had heretofore prevented its adoption. “ I the more earnestly,” says he, “ press upon your  
 “ attention this most interesting subject, as it does not  
 “ appear that the obstacles, which formerly prevented  
 “ Her Majesty’s Government from acquiescing in an  
 “ extension of the Church Establishment, need now  
 “ be taken into consideration, *the revenue having*  
 “ *within the last five years so exceedingly increased.*”  
 —p. 63.

Such were the urgent applications of Lieut.-Governor Arthur on this subject. Before he could obtain an answer to any of them, he had sanctioned votes of the Legislative Council, for aid to other bodies of Christians in erecting places of Divine Worship, and recorded his reasons for so doing on the books of the Council in the following terms:—

“ I should wish to record my deliberate opinion,  
 “ that, *until much more extensive assistance is afforded*  
 “ *to the Established Church*, such advances as these, in  
 “ aid of other religious communions, must necessarily  
 “ be made, *or a large class of the community will be*  
 “ *without any religious or moral instruction whatever.*

“ A state of things exists in this Colony, unknown in other communities ; and, if every effort be not made to reform, by religious instruction, the lowest orders, and especially the convict population, all other measures to reclaim them will be, if not wholly inoperative, at least of very transitory advantage.”—p. 73.

Again, in reference to this matter, in his Despatch of January 26th, 1836, he says, “ It is the best expedient that I can think of to supply, at a trifling charge, the lamentable want of a more extensive Church Establishment.” At the same time he proposes to charge the amount on the Land Revenue—which has been credited with the proceeds of the sale of the lands originally reserved to the Church.” But he adds what is well worthy of deep attention: “To avoid all possible misconception, however, *as it may not immediately occur to your Lordship*, it is proper I should state, that *the lands were reserved exclusively for the support of the Church of England.*”—p. 69.

That, under so pressing a want of the means of any religious instruction for the Colony which he governed, and having been himself compelled to have recourse to expedients so questionable, he should have, at length, received with acquiescence, and even with pleasure, the announcement of any mode sanctioned by Government of supplying that want—even though it rooted up the very foundations of a Church Establishment—may grieve, but can hardly surprise us.

Such is a brief outline of the course which has been pursued in Australia, in establishing this most novel and most unrighteous principle. To look minutely into all its details would not suit the present occasion. Be it sufficient to say, that by it not only every variety of Protestant Dissent is fostered and patronized, but the Romish Church itself is installed with equal honour,

and recognised as of equal purity with our own. It is notorious that a Roman Catholic Bishop is not only permitted to exercise Episcopal authority in the Colony, but also receives a stipend of 500*l.* per annum from Government for his services. The history of this affair is so illustrative of the prevailing policy, that I will briefly narrate it to you.

In February, 1835, Lord Aberdeen appointed four additional Roman Catholic Chaplains for New South Wales, with an annual stipend of 150*l.* to each. One of these was Dr. Polding, who, like the others, “was intended only to officiate as Chaplain; but, as it was subsequently considered advisable by the Church to which he belonged, that he should be permitted to exercise Episcopal authority, the sanction of the Government was given to the arrangement.”—p. 27. Lord Aberdeen, however, was so fully satisfied of the unfitness of his being paid by the British Government in the character of *Bishop*, that, in the Despatch which announced the appointment to Sir R. Bourke, he distinctly said, that, although his powers would be superior to those of the Rev. Mr. Ullathorne, who, as Vicar-General, received 200*l.* per annum, he “*was not prepared to sanction the augmentation of Dr. Polding’s stipend,*” even to that sum, unless Mr. Ullathorne were transferred to Van Diemen’s Land. This being arranged, Dr. Polding was to receive 200*l.* per annum; but with a distinct intimation that no higher stipend would be sanctioned by the English Minister. However, before Dr. Polding’s arrival in the Colony, a change of Government had taken place in England—and immediately Sir R. Bourke scrupled not, in despite of the Despatch from Lord Aberdeen, to “take the advice of the Council upon the amount of stipend which they would be willing to assign to

“ Dr. Polding, if Her Majesty’s Government consented “ to enlarge it.”—p. 28. The Council recommended 500*l.* per annum, which was proposed to the Government at home, and forthwith assented to, although it was in direct contradiction to the principle established five months before, and acted upon in all cases of the Church of England, that “ the amount of private contribution should be the condition and measure of public aid.”—p. 15. In this case, there was no private contribution whatever.

This was not all. Lord Aberdeen, I have said, had refused to sanction any greater allowance than 150*l.* per annum to Dr. Polding, if the Vicar-General remained in New South Wales, having a stipend of 200*l.* per annum. It was arranged, therefore, that he should be transferred to Van Diemen’s Land : instead, however, of going, either he or a successor of his is still there as Vicar-General with a stipend of 250*l.* per annum—and this, too, *without any private contribution*.

The case is not yet complete. Dr. Polding, in his passage to New South Wales, landed in Van Diemen’s Land ; and, upon his urgent representation, while he was there, the sum of 1500*l.* was voted by the Council towards the erection of a Roman Catholic Chapel. *No private contribution was made*—and the vote was transmitted to England for confirmation or rejection, with this addition, that the Council was ready to increase the grant. Lord Glenelg found the case rather hard of digestion ; but he managed it : he “ saw no “ reason for departing in the case of any other religious denominations from the rule which had been “ laid down with respect to the members of the Church “ of England. From the amount of the grant, he “ apprehended that it had been made without stipulating for any corresponding contribution ; a proceeding



“ which *he should much regret, as open to serious objection.*” He tacitly, however, allowed the grant, expressing only this proviso: “ *Should a further sum be required* for this purpose, you will not propose any additional grant, unless a moiety of the whole estimated expense, including the original grant of 1,500*l.*, be provided by the voluntary contribution of the parties applying for assistance.”—p. 67.

To give full effect to this case, one thing alone seems wanting, that aid to a Church of England application should be withheld because of insufficient contribution—and that deficiency is supplied. We are presented with some extracts from the Minutes of the Council of 14th October, 1835, at which the grant for 1500*l.* was remarked upon as having been made “ for Roman Catholic purposes, on more favourable terms than in cases of Protestant application.” “ The rural Dean” (the Clergyman of highest rank in the Colony)—after observing that, “ as the Roman Catholics would now be more than ever disposed to proselytize, he wished that assistance should be given to such Communities as were less opposed to the Church of England than the Roman Catholics were”—proceeded to say, that “ in reference to the erection of Churches generally, and more especially in *Trinity Parish, where the inhabitants were poor*, he thought it desirable Government should not limit itself to cases where one-half was subscribed.”—p. 72. In a subsequent Minute, transmitted to the Government in England, Lieut.-Governor Arthur says, “ It is with extreme regret I inform you, that the sums voted in aid of *the Church, so much required in Trinity Parish*, have not yet been appropriated (although an aid of 500*l.* has been received from England), *in consequence of the requisite funds, by private subscription, not having been raised.*”—p. 77.

Is anything more wanted?

The whole is wound up with the following very edifying communication from Lieutenant-Governor Arthur to the Colonial Secretary, dated 26th January, 1836:—

“With regard to the proposed Chapel at Hobart Town, (to which the 1500*l.* was granted,) there is, “I may observe, *a very unfortunate schism between the Priest and his congregation*; so that I apprehend there is little probability of their contributing towards a new place of worship,” *i. e.* they will give nothing to meet this large grant. “The Roman Catholics have hitherto been a very inconsiderable body in this community, possessing one very rude Chapel in Hobart Town, and a school in connexion with it. *The arrival of Dr. Polding*, however, has excited a degree of energy, which has given them a more influential appearance, and *has had the effect of recalling some persons who had been in the habit of attending the Established Church.*” \*—p. 70.

Thus the British people have the satisfaction of learning, from the highest official authority, that the

\* The Papists are not slow to act on the vantage-ground thus given to them. “An Association for propagating the Faith” has been recently established, the first anniversary of which was held on the 18th of September of the present year, with great magnificence, “in the Metropolitan Church of the Conception,” Dublin, at which “His Grace the Most Rev. Dr. Murray officiated as High Priest,” attended by “upwards of a hundred Clergy, in their surplices and soutans.” The preacher, “the Rev. Dr. Kenny, S.J.” (President of the Jesuit College at Clongowes), “delivered an admirable discourse in the bold and striking manner for which he is so remarkable.” One sentence I subjoin: “It must be allowed that a fair opportunity is given to us at present by the ruling powers; that the Government, instead of being, as formerly, marked by the strongest animosity against us, is now ready to show us justice and favour, and *to aid our Prelates in sending Missionaries to foreign countries.* I feel grateful for the benefit, and I offer prayers to God to continue this favour to us. *As far as they have shown kindness to us, we feel grateful, and I trust the time will shortly come when they will be induced to grant us a due proportion of the favours which they lavish on other denominations of Christians.*” —The “*Weekly Freeman's Journal*” of 21st Sept., 1839.

energies of Government, and the treasures of the State, are employed in the goodly work of giving fresh life and activity to Popery, even in those regions where it was on the point of expiring by reason of its own weakness.

But Australia, the great seedplot of future nations, English by name—(God grant that they may be truly English too in principle and faith!)—is not the only region in which we have to deplore this seeming abandonment of those ancient principles of national policy, which hallowed our political institutions by combining them with the establishment of true Religion.

In the CANADAS, provision was made by the liberality of King George III. for the future support of the Church, of which he was, not in words and by office only, but in heart and affection, a nursing father. He endowed with Crown Lands, the increasing value of which, it was intended by him, should bear a due proportion to the increase of the wealth and population of the Colony, “a Protestant Clergy.”

What may be the strict meaning of that phrase in legal construction, as high legal authorities have differed, or seemed to differ, it would ill become me in this place, or on this occasion, to affect to pronounce a judgment. It is enough for my present purpose to state, that on the supposed vagueness of this phrase has been built a claim not only for all sorts of teachers of all varieties of Religion calling itself Protestant, but also for the Clergy of the Church of Rome itself. The Government at home (I lament to say it) has most unhappily sanctioned and encouraged this most mischievous and unprincipled agitation. With unfairness, which, unless on the plainest evidence, ought to be

incredible, it has directed Sir G. Arthur\* to urge the Provincial Legislature to realize these wild views: thus diverting the endowments of true Religion to the maintenance of every species and form of error, in contravention of the express provisions of the Constitutional Act of 1791, even as declared in the Opinion of the law officers of 1819, who excluded the claims of all other Ministers of Religion except the Clergy of the Churches of England and Scotland. The Government did this, even though they expressly made their confidence in the correctness of that Opinion the ground of their refusal to comply with the prayer of the Bishop and Clergy of Upper Canada, that the question of the appropriation of the Clergy-reserves to any other Clergy, than themselves, should be referred for judicial decision either to the Judges of England, or to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.†

One of the Legislative Bodies of Upper Canada, in willing compliance with the policy thus recommended by Government, actually passed a Bill, by which a Popish Bishop was to be endowed with an annual stipend out of the produce of those lands, which were granted by King George III., and confirmed by a solemn act of the British Parliament, for the maintenance of a Protestant Clergy! And, though the other branch of the Colonial Legislature was less accommodating, and refused its consent to that measure; yet a Bill has passed both those Houses, and will be laid before our own Parliament, previous to its receiving the Royal

\* See Despatches on creation of Rectories in Upper Canada, p. 445: Lord Glenelg to Sir G. Arthur, 26 Dec. 1837. See also Lord Glenelg to Sir F. B. Head, 7 Sept. 1837 (Despatches to and from Sir F. Head, p. 93).

† Copy of Despatch from Lord Glenelg to Sir G. Arthur, K.C.H., of 15 Nov. 1838:—"As Her Majesty's Government see no reason to doubt the correctness of the Opinion delivered on this subject in 1819 by the Law Officers of the Crown, they do not consider it necessary to originate any proceedings on the subject before the Judges of England or the Privy Council."

Assent, by which all the Clergy-reserve lands are to be sold, and the proceeds invested in the Crown, and applied to purposes of Religion, generally, under the direction of the Imperial Parliament.

This last particular of the enactment must give us hope: for before such appropriation shall be made, we cannot doubt, that Parliament will direct that some course be taken to ascertain the right construction of the phrase "a Protestant Clergy" in the Act which was designed to give effect to the pious munificence of Her Majesty's Royal Grandfather; and as little can we doubt, that, if it be found that the phrase in that Statute means, as we trust it means, *Clergy of the Church of England*, no false liberality, no readiness to sacrifice principles to supposed expediency, will prevent the British Legislature from doing what Religion and justice shall be equally found to demand.

Meanwhile, it is painful to contemplate the effects produced by the protracted conflict on this most momentous subject, and the difficulties which in consequence have obstructed the operations of the Church in spreading the knowledge of Divine Truth through the Colony. By a return made to Government, and laid before Parliament, of the result of a census now in progress (so far as these results were known), it appears that of between 200,000 and 300,000 persons, included in that return, almost a ninth were of no profession of Religion whatsoever,—and this, although sufficient latitude was taken: for, under the general title of religious bodies, there is a column not only for each of several uncouth denominations, such as Tunkers, Mennonites, and others, but also one for Deists, and another for Freethinkers; yet the number of those who are of *no religious body*, or profession, is nearly equal to the number of Roman Catholics. Thank God! in spite

of all discouragement, the Church nearly doubles the number of any other denomination.\*

There is another official return, viz., of "Annual Payments to Religious Bodies, to which the Faith of Her Majesty's Government is pledged." In it, we find that the annual payment to "the Roman Catholic Bishop and Priests" is about the same as to the "Presbyterian Clergy of the Church of Scotland," and more than equal to what is pledged to the other two specified denominations, the "Presbyterians of the united Synod

\* In reference to this important particular, I may be permitted to notice the statements, or opinions, contained in two documents of rather an authoritative character :—

1. The Report of the Committee of the House of Commons, ordered to be printed 22nd July, 1827, says :—"With regard to the other religious sects, the Committee have found much difficulty in ascertaining the exact numerical proportions which they bear one to the others ; but the evidence has led them to believe, that *neither the adherents of the Church of England, nor those of the Church of Scotland, form the most numerous religious body* within the Province of Upper Canada."

2. *The Report of the Earl of Durham, &c.*, has the following passage, p. 63. "The Church of England in Upper Canada, *by numbering in its ranks all those who belong to no other sect.*" I stop here to remark, that, in the Census just taken, the Church (which is not a sect) does not number these nondescripts "in its ranks;" for not only is there a distinct head for persons of "no religious body," as has been stated above ; but there is also a return of a large number, of whom nothing is known, whether they are of any, or no, or of what, religious body. It follows, therefore, that the number of *professing* Members of the Church of England is nearly double that of any other Body. The Report proceeds :—"The Church of England, &c., represents itself as being more numerous, than any single denomination of Christians in the country. Even admitting, however, &c., it is not therefore to be expected, that the other Sects, three at least of whom, the *Methodists*, the *Presbyterians*, and the (*Roman*) *Catholics*, claim to be individually more numerous than the Church of England, should acquiesce quietly in the supremacy thus given to it."

I will subjoin an extract from the Toronto Almanac and Royal Calendar for 1839—compiled by Mr. Fothergill, the Editor of a liberal Journal, called the *Palladium*,—who is understood to be not a member of the Church, nor very friendly to it :—"The present applications for Clergymen" (of the Church of England), "from various parts of the Province, amount to *more than one hundred*. There is, indeed, scarcely a settled Township in the Province, in which a pious and active Clergyman would not find ample employment amongst our people, who are everywhere to be found in great numbers ; except, perhaps, in Glengarry, which is divided almost equally between the Roman Catholics and Presbyterians."

“ of Upper Canada,” and the “ British Wesleyan Methodist ;” though the number of these two exceeds that of the Roman Catholics by more than half !

In reading an official return of an “ Annual Payment to the Roman Catholic Bishop, to which *the Faith of Her Majesty’s Government is pledged*,” it is not easy to forbear asking ourselves, what would have been, in other times, the feelings of the British People on such an outrage, if, indeed, in other times, such an outrage on those feelings could have been attempted ? and, even in these our days, we are tempted to ask, what will be the feelings of the British People, when they read, in the despatches between the Colonial Secretary and the Governor of Upper Canada, that the expedient suggested for redeeming the Faith of Government pledged to Popery, is, to throw into hodgepodge, for the support of Religion of every name and phase, the funds given by a truly Protestant Prince for the maintenance of his own Church ?

The Roman Catholic Bishop, who thus holds “ the faith of Government ” in pledge, has recently presumed so far on the favour which he enjoys, as to set at defiance all the Statutes which were designed by our forefathers to guard the supremacy of the Crown. During many years he called himself Bishop of *Regiopolis*, a designation which revealed at once the object of his wish, and his consciousness that it was unlawful. But on the arrival of the Earl of Durham, as Governor-General of the North American Colonies, Dr. Macdonnell addressed a letter to him, “ respectfully, but “ fearlessly and unhesitatingly submitting such information as his opportunities had enabled him to acquire ;” in particular, that the Irish Roman Catholic Emigrants, and the Scotch Highlanders (who also are Roman Catholics) “ feel greatly disappointed at being

*“ excluded from their share of the Clergy-reserves.”* Nay, he has the confidence to speak of their exclusion, as withholding *“ the Clergy-reserves from the purposes for which they were intended.”* This letter, containing these monstrous claims, was subscribed by him, no longer Bishop of Regiopolis, but *“ Bishop of Kingston, Upper Canada ;”* and the illegal title was not only admitted by the Earl of Durham, who, in his Report, p. 65, refers to this very letter, as the letter of *“ the venerable Roman Catholic Bishop of Kingston ;”* but it is printed and laid before Parliament, by order of the Government, in Appendix A. to that Report, p. 65, and noted in the margin as the *“ letter from the Right Reverend A. Macdonnell, Catholic Bishop of Kingston.”*

Upon the whole of the important matter, which we have here reviewed, there are two questions which force themselves upon our minds :—

1. How this active, manifold, and hourly increasing encouragement of the Church of Rome is consistent with the principle which displaced a Popish for a Protestant dynasty ?—2. How this equal support of all that calls itself Religion, be it true or false, can be reconciled to the duty of the sworn advisers of a Sovereign, who has herself sworn to *“ maintain, to the utmost of her power, the Laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant Reformed Religion established by Law, and the doctrine, worship, and discipline thereof,”* not only *“ within England and Ireland,”* but also *“ within the territories thereunto belonging ?”* These are questions which are prompted by the truest loyalty to the Crown, and demand to be answered on higher principles, than official convenience, or the fleeting interests of a Party, can supply.



I cannot leave the subject of the Church in the Canadas, without saying that it is to me a matter of great gratification to recognise in you, my Reverend Brethren, and not only in you, but in the Laity of these counties, some of the most strenuous and ardent assertors of the rights of your fellow Protestants and fellow Churchmen in those Provinces, as was proved by your energetic petitions to Parliament. Communication with those who are most immediately interested in the welfare of the Church there, enables me to say, that they are deeply sensible of the value of your exertions, and grateful for the feeling which called them forth.

---

In turning from this matter of profound interest to the cause of true Religion in our Colonies, to one which has more immediately affected the same sacred cause at home, you will anticipate my intention to address a few words to you on the scheme of National Education recently propounded by the Government, and still, unfortunately, impending over us.

Of a measure, which escaped the direct condemnation of one House, by only a majority far smaller than it has been the practice of the Constitution to deem necessary for the sanction of any ministerial proposition, and which was actually condemned by a larger majority of the other House than ever before, on any occasion, was found in opposition to the Crown—to say of such a measure, so dealt with by Parliament, that it is most unsound in principle, and would be most pernicious in practice, is not to exceed those bounds of decorum which are especially imposed by an occasion like the present.

The principle of the measure is one, practically at least, of indifference to all considerations, if not of Religion, yet of truth or falsehood in Religion. Indeed, it is avowed by the noble Marquis who is to take the lead in carrying the measure into execution, in the report of a speech lately delivered by him in Parliament, and circulated by the Committee of which he is the head,—that he considers “the training of children in habits of order, cleanliness, discipline, and industry, as of *equal importance with religion*.” \* He further says (speaking of the inspection of the schools), that “the Government intends not to propose anything but what it considers will conduce to *the grand object of secular improvement*”—p. 32.

Another noble Member of the Committee, who, as Home Secretary, must have had a principal share in the concoction of the measure, in a speech circulated by the same authority, says that he does not think much of the objection to the proposed scheme, that by it, in some places, the doctrines of the Romanists and of Socinians would be taught; for “there is,” says he, “the great and countervailing advantage of *imparting knowledge*,† and of giving instruction in the *simplest*

\* Substance of Speech of the Marquis of Lansdowne, p. 30. The context is as follows:—“It has never entered into the mind of any one member of her Majesty’s Government, that the inspection should be used for the purpose of interfering, directly or indirectly, with religious instruction. But what is proposed, and what it is most important to effect, is, that the inspection shall be applied to the introduction of those improvements which even in secular education may be effected; and those admirable arrangements which your Lordships may witness at the school in Norwood, established by the Poor Law Commissioners—arrangements not bearing upon the question of Religion, but bearing upon that which is of equal importance,—the training the children in habits of order, cleanliness, discipline, and industry,—which might form a part of a general system of education, without interfering with those high truths which it is the duty and the privilege of the Church to inculcate.”

† As a comment on this sentiment of the Noble Lord’s, I may be permitted to cite the opinion of one of our ablest and most experienced Judges, Lord Abinger, delivered to the Grand Jury at Leicester at the last Spring Assizes:—

*"elements of religious truth."*\* What are those "simplest " elements of religious truth," which, forming part of the systems of Popery and Socinianism, neutralize the poison of their other ingredients, and render them wholesome spiritual food for the youth of this yet Christian and Protestant land—fit milk for babes in Christ—the noble speaker omitted to state.

I repeat, therefore, on the high authorities which I have cited (and which might be confirmed by many passages of an authorised pamphlet circulated by the Committee), that the principle of the measure is one of indifference to all considerations, if not of Religion, yet of truth or falsehood in religion; and, as such, it has a tendency to do more of evil, in corrupting the minds and hearts of the people, than it can ever be hoped to do of good, by the utmost intellectual improvement, which, were it the best possible system of mere teaching, could be produced by it. Thank God! the unsophisticated good sense and sound principles of the English nation have rejected the proposal; more than three thousand petitions have spoken the judgment of the people on this ill-advised attempt to lower the tone of

"There were only three persons who could not read and write, out of a calendar of 20 persons; and the doctrine which was lately promulgated was, 'Give the poor education, and you destroy crime.' This had not turned out to be the case with the calendar before the court; for he found that most of the desperate robberies and burglaries were committed by persons who could read and write well. Now, although he would never discourage educating the lower classes of society, he would still boldly affirm that education, if not founded on religious and moral principle, instead of becoming a blessing to the poor, would in the end turn out a curse. To give a sound education to the poor, moral and religious instruction must accompany it—the receiver must be well made to know, not only the moral duties he has to perform, but the religious ones. Education, without religious instruction, would not control the strong passions of the human race; and he had only again to repeat that the various calendars throughout the circuit had plainly convinced him that it would be far better to leave the poorer classes of the community in ignorance than to give them an education which had not for its groundwork our revealed and blessed religion."

\* Substance of Lord John Russell's Speech, p. 14.

our national morality, and national piety, to a level with the institutions of countries to which we were not wont to look for examples in either. What are the natural fruits of such systems we have not been left to conjecture. We are taught by experience—happily the experience of other countries—to shun, as we would a pestilence, the contagion of this infidel liberality.

Not many years ago, in one of the Northern States or America, where the experiment has been tried on the largest scale, a public meeting of seven hundred persons was occupied in denouncing the law which required the observance of the sabbath, as “an infringement of natural liberty;” and in protesting against the illiberal practice of requiring an oath, in attestation of the truth of evidence given in a court of justice,—not on the ground of the conscientious scruple entertained by the Society of Friends, and some other sects, against the lawfulness of all oaths,—but simply and merely “because the taking of an oath implies belief in the existence of God; and though,” they were pleased to say, “it is desirable that all should hold that belief, yet they deemed it inconsistent with natural freedom to demand from any one an avowal of it.”

A still more awful illustration of the danger of this laxity of principle has been exhibited among those American prisoners who were recently taken in Upper Canada. On the authority of one of the highest functionaries in that province, I can state, that a very large number, though not uninstructed in secular learning, were found to be absolutely without even the profession of Religion in any form.

Since I have been on this Tour of Visitation, I have received from a truly Apostolic man, whose praise must be well known to you, the venerable Bishop Chase, a copy of “an Address delivered” by him, so

recently as in June last, “ to the Annual Convention “ of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of “ Illinois.” In this Address there is one passage, bearing so strongly on the subject of religious education, and exhibiting such overwhelming testimony of the tremendous practical results of education not based on true religion, that, long as the passage is, I cannot forbear reading it to you :—

“ In our own country,” says he, “ where religion has “ not been chiefly attended to, our young men have “ grown up to resemble those of whom the Apostle “ speaks: *atheoi*—atheists. They are ‘ in the world,’ “ but ‘ without God ;’ living as if there were no God “ to bring them to an account for their deeds. Had “ the Church of God done her duty; had she insisted” (God grant that we may always insist!) “ that religion, “ as it is the one thing needful, should also be the first “ thing attended to in the education of youth; had she “ not consented to leave this all-important matter un- “ performed, or performed by those who were not “ shepherds of the flock; had she inculcated the know- “ ledge of divine things with the same zealous care “ with which she has insisted on the study of the na- “ tural sciences,—the state of our country would be “ far different from what it is. Good men would not “ have cause to weep at the downhill course in which “ all things are running. The good old way—the way “ pursued by the Apostles—of insisting that men, with “ all their house, should be baptized—all should be “ brought into the Church of God, and there trained in “ the nurture and admonition of the Lord; that children “ should be fed with the milk, and the adults should “ partake of the strong meat of God’s word :—this way, “ alas! has been neglected, and others, for a time more “ engaging, suited to men’s vain feelings, have been

“pursued. It was an awful epoch when this began to be exemplified in those who professed to conduct the destinies of the Church ; when men’s ways were preferred to the ways and sacraments of God. And it is heart-rending to behold now the consequences. *A vast majority of our country are out of covenant with their Maker ; and are uninstructed in the first rudiments of the Christian faith ; not understanding even the terms in which Religion is inculcated. If you call upon them to repent of their sins—to learn their fallen state by nature, and to implore the mercy of God in Jesus Christ—they tell you they know nothing of the necessity of either ; they never bound themselves to any religion ; and never intend to do so. Most of our youth cannot say the commandments ; and those who can have never heard them so expounded as to show the guilt of their transgression. They have been told there is some short way of ‘getting religion,’ and they hope to find it without all this trouble.*”\*

\* America is not the only country which testifies to the inefficacy of instruction, not based on religion, as an instrument of moral improvement. Mr. H. Lytton Bulwer (a gentleman, who will not be charged with unwillingness to take liberal views of any subject), in his work entitled ‘France—Social, Literary, and Political,’ has a chapter “on Crime,” in which he makes some important references to M. Guerry’s ‘Statistique Morale de la France.’ I cite one or two passages :—

“In estimating the influence of instruction, M. Guerry takes, as the test of education, the list of those returned to the Minister of War, at the period of conscription, as able to read and write ; and making use of the five divisions I have mentioned,” (division of France into five regions ; M. Guerry has used maps, as well as tables, which maps are tinted, the darkest tint indicating the *maximum* of crime ; the lighter tint, the *minimum* ; similar maps are given by him, showing the state of education,) “he compares,” says Mr. Bulwer, “the maps which paint the state of instruction, with those which depict the state of crime. From this comparison we see that, while the crimes against *persons* are the most frequent in Corsica, the provinces of the south-east, and Alsace, where the people are well instructed, there are the *fewest of these crimes* in Berry, Limosin, and Brittany, where the people are the *most ignorant*.”

“Such is the case in respect to crimes against the Person. As for

From all approaches to such a state, may God, in His mercy, protect this country! But, in order that

crimes against *Property*, it is almost invariably those Departments that are the best informed, which are the most criminal. Should M. Guerry not be altogether wrong, then, this must appear certain,—that if instruction do not increase crime, which may be a matter of dispute, there is no reason to believe that it diminishes it.”—Vol. i. p. 182.

Commending this passage to the attention of those who ascribe so much moral efficacy to mere instruction, I will present another passage from this gentleman's book, still more worthy of their notice for the sound philosophic view indicated in it. In truth, Mr. Bulwer does not lay much stress on M. Guerry's tables; which may be as inconclusive as Mr. Porter represents them to be, without invalidating what follows:—“It is not merely on account of M. Guerry's figures, that I think the conclusion at which he here arrives probable and likely to be just. No one ever yet pretended to say that in Italy, where was the most civilisation during the middle ages, there was the least crime; and I do not place much faith in the philosopher who pretends that the knowledge which develops the passions, is an instrument for their suppression, or that where there are the most desires, there is likely to be the most order and the most abstinence in their gratification.”—P. 184. I gladly hail the authority of Mr. Lytton Bulwer, in support of the great principle, that nothing short of firm and sound religious faith can be an effectual restraint on the passions of men; that any scheme of instruction which does not include this indispensable and fundamental particular, is unworthy the name of education.

But we have, I am sorry to say, similar confirmation of the same truth in this very Island; ay, even in that part of this Island, which we have been accustomed to regard (and, in the main, I believe, justly to regard) as having most of instruction, not only secular but religious. Still, in one great section of the population of that country, the vast mass of human beings accumulated in Glasgow, there is fearful attestation of the same kind as M. Guerry supplies from France. The following are parts of the evidence given before the Committee of the House of Commons on the combination of workmen. The witness is Mr. Alison, a gentleman, whose talents, station, and singular experience (as Sheriff of Lanarkshire) entitle him to the highest consideration. It appears from his evidence (No 2395), that upwards of 80,000 of the population of Glasgow “have hardly any moral or religious education at all.” The following passages are worthy of being cited in terms:—

2397. “I think the proportion of educated persons convicted [in Scotland] is fully as great as of uneducated; and I know, from the highest statistical authorities, that at this moment the progress of crime in Scotland, which is as well educated as any other part of the empire, the proportion of persons under instruction being as one to ten in Scotland, the progress of crime has been infinitely more rapid than in any other part of the empire. . . . It is unparalleled in any other part of Europe in the same period. . . . I should say from my own observation that there is *six times as much crime* in the manufacturing districts, as in the rural; I mean actually committed: taking into view the difference in the strictness of the police, probably it is *ten times greater!*”

1977. Do you see any means whatever of securing the peace and the happiness of those people, and the peace and happiness of the empire,

we may hope for that protection, be it our care (not to deserve it—that we cannot do, but) to show that we *value* it as we ought, by exerting our utmost energies, in obedience to His law, and in dutiful reliance on His aid.

It happened, by a coincidence too remarkable to pass unnoticed, that the day on which this warning voice was

except by giving to the children both the time and the means for moral and religious education?—"I think not; unless the habits of moral depravity which now overspread the skilled classes from the operation of those combinations are removed, I am firmly convinced that the existence of the British empire will be overthrown; that the moral pestilence will overturn entirely the social state of the country; and I see clearly round me every day, in Glasgow, such facts as prove that we may be considered as standing at the gate of a great pest-house. I see the labouring classes depraving to an extent under my eyes, which I cannot find language sufficiently strong to impress the committee with."

2405. "The proportion of religious acquirement to the existing number has decreased most prodigiously."

2406. "I ascribe a great portion of the present evils to that cause. I observed, that, among the prisoners committed to bridewell in Glasgow, the number of persons educated was to the uneducated as about four or five to one. I have no doubt, that a great proportion of those persons that could read and write a little, were, practically speaking, uneducated, that is to say, that they never read any books that were worth reading, that did not do them more harm than good; but *that, I conceive, has been the danger of education: if not most strictly looked after, it has generally been the means of doing more harm than good.*"

So much for Scotland. Considering how much has been said on high authority on England, especially by the Lord President, who thus sums up his remarks on this head:—"If a scale of Education were constructed, excluding Spain and Russia, and taking only the central states of Europe, England would come last in the scale, both as to the quantity and the quality of *secular* education,"—I shall be forgiven if, as an Englishman, I express my own gratification in confronting this statement by Lord Lansdowne of the inferiority of my poorer countrymen in *secular* instruction, with the following testimony to their general superiority over all other European nations in their *religious* instruction. I quote from "Appendix to Foreign Report, from J. C. Symons, esq.," p. 172, a gentleman selected by the Government for his Commission, on account of his very extensive experience and knowledge of the state of our people.—"Wages have increased since the French revolution all over the Continent, and, with partial exceptions, in every branch of manufacture: the consequence has been, as it probably always will be, less sobriety. High wages increasing sobriety is a contradiction well known to all those who employ many workmen. Men will not work hard, any longer than is necessary to satisfy certain wants; and the less they work, the more they amuse themselves. *There are, I know, many exceptions to this rule in England, where a sense of religion is a restraint and a reason to tens of thousands; but this is not the case on the Continent, where a principal of economy is the only motive for sobriety.*"



addressed to us from across the Atlantic, was the 3rd of June last—the very day on which Her Majesty in Council was advised to give the Royal Sanction to the “New Scheme of Public Education”—a scheme, one of the avowed principles of which is, that it is “the State’s peculiar duty, while it will grant all *proper facilities* for the uniting of religious instruction to secular, “to render *secular* instruction accessible to all, and to “improve *secular* instruction by *assistance from the public funds*, and by constant superintendence :”\* thus *excluding* the duty of testifying any special favour to instruction in that Religion, which the State recognises as true, and denying, by implication, the duty of giving to it any “assistance whatever from the public funds.”

I have said that this is one of the *avowed* principles of the scheme. It is so avowed in a publication circulated by order of the Committee of Privy Council, which several of you have received ; a publication, the object of which is declared to be, “To enable every “person interested in this national question to *ascertain what is the plan of Her Majesty’s Government*, and, “at the same time, to provide a *plain exposition of the principles* and arrangements which we conceive to “be involved in that plan.”†

But this official document, I am sorry to say, has carried the matter much further. After enlarging on the dangers from Chartism, it thus proceeds :—

“The sole effectual means of preventing the tremendous evils, with which the anarchical spirit of the “manufacturing population threatens the country, is “by giving to the working people a good *secular* education, to enable them to understand the true causes

\* Recent Measures for the Promotion of Education in England, p. 55.

† Ibid., p. 3.

“ which determine their physical condition, and regulate the distribution of wealth among the several classes of society.”\*

Thus it appears that in the judgment of the writers (can it be of the circulators ?) of this pamphlet, it is by no means necessary, that Religion should hereafter form even a subordinate element in the Public Education of England ; “ the *sole* means” of correcting the moral evils of the country, being to *instruct* “ the *working people* in the true causes which determine their physical condition, and regulate the distribution of wealth.” In plain English, Political Economy is henceforth to be the Poor Man’s Gospel ; and the true way of making him contented under all his privations in this life, is to open to him no prospect of an inheritance of happiness and glory beyond the grave !

But I may be told, that this is to draw an inference too strictly from a single passage, and that there are many places, in which the importance of Religion is amply recognised. Thus, at page 41, it is said that the master “ manufacturers and merchants have a deep stake in the moral, intellectual, and *religious* advancement of the People.” At page 45 we are told, that “ all instruction should be hallowed by Religion ;” and at page 46, the piety of the writers waxing warm, they bring themselves to say, by implication, that true Religion is the greatest blessing a people can receive : “ Next to the prevalence of true Religion, we most earnestly desire that the people should know how their interests are inseparable from those of the other orders of society.”

This sounds well ; and gladly would I overlook its glaring inconsistency with the passage cited above, if I could find any evidence of an attempt to make “ true

\* Recent Measures for the Promotion of Education in England, p. 44.

“ Religion ” a real, operative, effectual element in the system which they recommend. But no such thing,—they never even give us reason to guess what they mean by “ true Religion ; ” but having thus paid, in passing, a slight homage to the name, they immediately set themselves right, as political economists, by ridiculing the reality ; for their very next sentence is as follows :—“ If, on the “ other hand, *an opponent of popular education* ” (who is an opponent of it ?) “ should admit the existence of “ the evil and *the sufficiency of the remedy*,” (who, but an infidel, admits the sufficiency of *the* remedy, or of any remedy, of which the main ingredient is not the knowledge of “ true Religion ? ”) “ but should refuse “ to apply it, because it would violate his notions of “ the duty of the Government to diffuse the *orthodox faith*, we can only say that such a person is unfit for “ the government of men in the nineteenth century ; “ and that he is sacrificing, to his own opinions upon “ *abstruse questions of theology*, the certain and demonstrable happiness of millions of his fellow-creatures.” Now, as it will not be pretended that more is demanded, on the part of the Church, than that the matter of instruction in the National Schools shall include the Bible, the Catechism, and the Prayer-book, it is plain that the writers of this official pamphlet repudiate these books (at least the two latter), as containing nothing better than “ abstruse questions of theology,” which men of their enlightened understanding may very properly sneer at, as “ the Orthodox Faith.” In truth, it would not be easy to guess what faith, if any, they hold to be “ orthodox ” (that is, *true*), nor to which of the various “ religious denominations of this country,” if to any, they profess to belong.

But Government has, it seems, been baffled in all its attempts to give to the country the great boon it

was anxious to bestow, by difficulties and embarrassments “which have hitherto appeared insurmountable” (p. 47),—and which, I will venture to affirm, no reasonable man could ever expect to surmount. For what was the problem which the Government proposed to itself? It was to “devise a system consistent with the “principles of civil and religious liberty, and, at the “same time, *capable of combining all parties, and all “religious denominations.*”

Than the first of these two conditions—that “the “system should be consistent with the principles of civil “and religious liberty”—nothing could be more proper. The limitation was one which every upright and reasonable mind would cordially approve, and which no British Government could wisely, or safely, or honestly transgress. But of the other condition appended to this—that the system must be “capable of combining all “parties and all religious denominations”—the wisdom, and, I must take leave to add, the honesty, do not seem quite so obvious.

In looking to this part of the case, the first thing to be asked is—had the Government any special, ascertained, prescribed duties, which it was bound to keep steadily in view, and by them to regulate and control all its operations? In order to answer this question, we must recollect what the Government was undertaking to do,—to devise a plan of public education for the children of the working classes of our fellow-countrymen.

Now, if they are Christians, as I am sure the Members of the Committee of Privy Council are, they will not deny, as an abstract principle, that instruction in true Religion is the only sure foundation of anything that deserves the name of education. But if, as Christians, they acknowledge this, they must also, as

Christians, acknowledge, that it is their duty to begin their system by laying well this only sure foundation,—that this is a necessary, an indispensable part of the work, regard for which must limit and modify their attention to everything else. To say, as the authorized expositor of their scheme says for them,\*—that “Government is most anxious religious instruction should be united to secular, and will therefore grant all *proper facilities* for that purpose,” but will not give any “assistance to it from the public funds;” for their peculiar duty is limited to secular instruction,—“to make secular instruction accessible to all,”—to “improve the quality of secular instruction”—is to say, that in undertaking to rear the youth of England into a national temple of faith, and justice, and brotherly love, they are at perfect liberty to leave the foundation of the edifice to chance; and to content themselves with allowing others to lay it, if they will, and as they will. In other words, this is to say, that the architects are either fools or knaves. Now, as I am sure that the Members of the Committee are neither one nor the other, I am equally sure, that they would not—even if they lawfully could—realize the views which their expositor has laid down for them; but, in spite of seal, and superscription, and every other sign of official sanction, would rather give him up at once, and blame, it may be, their own rashness in confiding their case to such an advocate.

As Christians, therefore, I repeat, the Committee would seek to lay the foundation of their plan of “Public Education” in the knowledge of true Religion. But, if they could be indifferent to their duty as Christians, they would find the same duty enforced by considerations of another kind.

For, in the first place, they are the sworn Council-

\* P. 55.

lors of the Crown, trusted with administering the funds granted to the Crown "for the purposes of "Public Education;" they are bound, therefore, to make the Religion of their Sovereign,—that Religion, which not only the conviction and wishes of her own heart, but also her contract with her people, her Coronation Oath, binds Her Majesty to "maintain to the utmost "of her power;"—as her sworn Councillors, they are bound, I say, to make this Religion, that is, the Religion of the Church of England, to be the foundation of the system of National Education in England. They must do this, from regard to the conscience of their Royal Mistress. And this, be it observed, is no strained interpretation of the Royal Oath. There is no escape from it, through any of those subtleties which we have sometimes known used for that purpose. Here is no room for distinguishing between the executive and legislative capacities of the Sovereign. The matter is a plain, downright, straightforward question of faithfulness, or unfaithfulness, to a very simple and intelligible obligation. The act to be done is purely executive. Shall it be done, or shall it not?

But, in the second place, even if the Committee should be capable of setting aside this most important consideration (they will forgive my putting the case, merely as an hypothesis)—if they should have the hardihood to say, that the best way of maintaining the true Religion in England is, *not* to base the Education of the People upon it, they would not yet have enabled themselves to apply the grant, in the manner which their official writer intimates to be intended. Before they will venture so to apply it, they must resolve to trample, not only on the Conscience of the Sovereign, but also on the Law of the Land. They are *trustees*, and must, like other trustees, execute their trust according to

settled legal principles. If a sum be given in trust for purposes of Religion generally, the law requires that it be employed for the purposes of the Religion of the Church of England. If a sum be given in trust for purposes of *Education* generally, a Court of Equity would require, that it be applied for Education founded on Religion, the Religion of the Church of England. This is no antiquated doctrine, no obsolete principle, but a matter of every-day practice. A very few years ago, a late Master of the Rolls (Sir Thomas Plomer) recognised it, and decided accordingly. In the case of *Attorney-General v. Dean and Canons of Christ Church*, where was a devise in trust to constitute and support a *Grammar School*, with no other specification of the nature of the school, the learned judge, in pronouncing judgment, said "It is to be a Grammar School, and, in the absence of other evidence, *the Court can only establish it on the principle of Religious Education forming part of the plan, and that Religious Education being according to the laws of the land.*"—Jacob's Reports, p. 482.

Now, in the present case, there is a grant to the Crown by Act of Parliament, not, as in former years, "for building School-houses," but "~~for Public Education~~ in Great Britain in 1839." The terms of this grant must be construed to be for purposes of ~~Public Education~~, on the principle just stated, viz. "Religious Education forming part of the plan, and that Religious Education being according to the laws of the land."

Here, then, we have found a duty, which the Committee of the Privy Council, acting for the Crown, are bound to observe in administering the funds granted by Parliament to the Crown, and placed by the Crown in their hands. This duty they must bear carefully in mind in all their proceedings. They have no right—it

is not within their legal competence—to divert, in England,\* any portion of the Grant, from Education founded on the Religion which alone the law recognises as the Religion of England. Within this limitation, they may exercise their discretion;—beyond it, if they venture to extravagatate—if, for instance, they shall dare to establish, with the moneys thus granted, a Model School for Roman Catholics—they will become guilty of a High Crime and Misdemeanor—they will place themselves within the peril of the Law, from which a majority of two in the House of Commons may not always be found able and willing to bear them harmless.

I perceive, indeed, from the official pamphlet before me, that the Committee does not assent to the Law laid down by Sir Thomas Plomer; but that a perfectly new principle is introduced by them into our jurisprudence—a principle which, I suspect, will hardly be recognised in Westminster Hall, and, therefore, may be found a little dangerous, if relied upon in Downing-street. That I may do it justice, I will cite it in the words of its author:—“ One principle our laws require “should be preserved inviolate under all circumstances, “*viz., that the established Church shall suffer no detriment,*” (we would have been thankful for this admission, had not the learned writer proceeded to explain) “but should *hold its position among the religious “denominations of the Country,* as the Church whose “head is the Sovereign, and whose institutions are inter- “woven with those of the temporal power.” That is, the Church is one of the various “religious denominations of the country,” distinguished indeed by having “the Sovereign for its head,” and by having “*its “institutions interwoven with those of the temporal*

\* What they are bound to do in the other part of “Great Britain” is not now in question.



*power*,"—p. 88. What may be the exact meaning of this last member of the sentence, I must profess myself utterly unable to conjecture. But it is perfectly clear, that it is not intended to include any right of the Church to preference in the contemplation of the Law, as being *the* Church. It is also plain, that this learned Commentator deems it a principle of the Law of England, that no Church is any longer to be especially regarded as *the* Church—that the one heretofore called "the Church of England" has really no right to any such exclusive title; for all Churches, and all Sects, which may be acknowledged by any of Her Majesty's subjects, are alike called, by a new and liberal style, "the religious denominations of England," and have all an equal right to support and maintenance from the State. If there could be any doubt that this is *part* of the meaning of the sentence which I have cited (for, I repeat, I am utterly incapable of even guessing the whole), the doubt would be removed by looking back to the immediately preceding page, where we find the principle asserted in a more luminous and impressive form. "No Government could long exist in this country which should either neglect *the legal right* which the Established Church has *to expect* the protection and support of the Executive Government" (how ample this concession!) "or which, on the other hand, should refuse to admit that a large body of *Her Majesty's Subjects who dissent from the Established Church* have A LEGAL RIGHT TO AN EQUAL DISTRIBUTION of *all the secular advantages derivable from a Government supported by the public Funds.*" p. 87. Incredible as it must appear, this is gravely put forth, as the Law of the Land, by a Committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council!—happily, not the Judicial Committee.

Now, upon this, which is really the pith and marrow

of the whole document, "the plain exposition of the " Committee's principles," I must take leave to make one very obvious remark. The writer says, " No Government " could long exist in this country, which should *refuse* to " admit" a certain alleged " legal right of Her Majesty's " subjects dissenting from the Established Church;" and this is said, as if he thought it a matter of choice, consideration, and discretion for the Government, whether they will make or refuse the admission. But surely it ought not to be necessary to remind him, or any one else, that the Government has no discretion whatever in such a matter. Whether an alleged " legal right" exist, or not, is a question of law. If it exist, it is the duty of Government to give effect to it ;—if it does not exist, it is equally the duty of Government to resist all claim to it—a duty, which an honest Government would discharge, be the consequence, as concerns their permanency as a Government, what it may. One thing more an honest Government would do. If they have a doubt on the question, they would call on the Law Officers of the Crown to solve the doubt, and to make themselves responsible for their solution. Will the Committee of Privy Council take this very plain, easy, and most constitutional course, and then act on the result? It would save them a world of trouble—and give perfect satisfaction to all whom they ought to wish to satisfy.

Till this is done, I shall be excused, if, adhering to Sir T. Plomer's judgment of the Law, I venture to call on the Committee, if they are sincere in their endeavour for an effective scheme of National Education, to lay their foundation in the National Religion. Having laid that foundation broad and deep, let them build on it as largely, and as widely as they will—inviting all, compelling none. For instance, to meet the most obvious case, let no child be compelled either to attend *Divine Service in the Church*, if his parents object to it on an

alleged scruple of conscience, or to learn the Catechism, or anything else to which the parents may object on a similar ground, in any school maintained wholly or partially by aid from the State.

If the Committee refuse to take some such course as this, they avow that their claim for "Her Majesty's subjects who dissent from the Established Church" is a claim, not of conscience, but of ambition:—that the contest is not, whether the children of the poor shall be taught, and well-taught; but, whether the teaching shall be that of the Church or of the Conventicle—whether Papists, Unitarians, Jumpers, Ranters, Irvingites, Socialists, shall not henceforth be recognised, as having "a right"—be it "a legal right" or not—"to an equal distribution" of the privilege of educating, and being paid by the State for educating, the rising generation of Englishmen:—this being one of "the secular advantages derivable from a Government supported by the public funds."

And here it may be well to observe, that it is a very gross fallacy to speak of violating the rights of conscience, by holding out to the poor a system of Education based on a Religion which they do not acknowledge. Do the vast majority of those, whose ignorance is depicted by the President of the Council, or the late Home Secretary, in colours so fearful, yet so true—do they feel any conscientious repugnance to the National Religion? Do they acknowledge the superiority of any of the numerous forms of Dissent? Do they think about these things? Do they care for, or understand, their differences? Nothing like it. The very case put forward by those noble Lords, and by the pamphlet of the Committee, rests on the besotted ignorance of the great "mass of the population in the manufacturing districts,

“and great towns,”—on the total absence of all consciousness of the value of Religion among them,—on the deadness of their moral sensibility,—on their almost “brutal” indifference to everything but the objects of sense.

Let us take, first, the description given by the Lord President of the state of “those great manufacturing classes” (I use his own words) “whom it is the nature of our social system to accumulate, but for whom, unhappily, it has not hitherto been a part of our social system to provide the means of Education.” “In Manchester, Leeds, York, and other great towns, particularly in the North of England, there has been revealed an amount of ignorance most disgraceful to a civilized nation. It is shown, that in four of the great manufacturing towns there are 80,000 children growing up without the shadow of Education, and that of the grown-up population of Manchester, and the surrounding places, there is only something like the proportion of one-fourth that can either read or write, the remainder being in that condition of hopeless ignorance, which prepares the way for those ebullitions of passion which are the result of ignorance, and which threaten the peace and security of society.”—“In these 80,000 uninstructed children now growing out of infancy, as it appeared, in three or four only of the great towns of the North, *without any Creed*, if it were not a *farce to talk of Creeds in connexion with persons so ignorant*, your Lordships may see the rising Chartists of the next age.”—*Lord Lansdowne’s Speech*, pp. 15—17.

Let us next attend to Lord John Russell. He gives us two painfully interesting Reports from Chaplains of gaols. The Chaplain of the gaol at Lancaster, in his Report for 1838, says, that of 1129 prisoners, seven only were familiar with the Holy Scriptures, and con-

versant with the principles of Religion—516 were quite ignorant of the simplest truths—though 995 could say the Lord's Prayer, not more than 20 or 30 had habitually attended any place of Divine Worship. "This estimate," says the Report, "will be almost undisputed by all those who have observed the almost general desertion of the house of God by that portion of the working population which consists of males in the prime of life; and I think that, if the subject were investigated, it would appear, that this desertion is in the ratio of the density of population. Village congregations would be found least obnoxious to this remark, and those of large towns most so." Upon this the Noble Lord very reasonably asks, "Is not this a dreadful peculiarity in the state of society? Is it not dreadful to think, that where there are the most criminals, and where the population is the densest, and where there ought to be as complete education as possible, the house of God is deserted by that portion of the population which consists of males in the prime of life?" And he concludes his comments by deploring "the danger of promoting practical infidelity by *total ignorance*."\*

The same Noble Lord, in his Letter to the Lord President, says, "The Reports of the Chaplains of gaols show, that to a large number of unfortunate prisoners a knowledge of the fundamental truths of natural and revealed Religion has never been imparted." And a most unhappy confirmation of this statement is produced by the Committee's pamphlet. The Report of the Chaplain of the County gaol at Bedford, in 1838, says, "that their great leading characteristic was ignorance, *heathenish ignorance* of the

\* Lord John Russell's Speech, pp. 14, 15.

“ simplest truths.” “ As to the condition, mentally and morally, of his unhappy charge, he regretted to say it could scarcely be more ignorant or degraded. It was his conviction that no pen could depict, in colours sufficiently dark, the moral and spiritual ignorance and debasement of the vastly greater number of those unhappy beings who pass through the prisons.” The Chaplain of the County gaol at Warwick thus reports, in 1836 :—“ With regard to those important parts of Education, Religion and morality, generally speaking, no instruction whatever appears to have been given to them: for, in a *vast majority* of instances, the persons who come to prison are *utterly ignorant both of the simplest truths of Religion*, and of the plainest precepts of morality.” The Pamphlet proceeds :—“ Many similar extracts might be given from the Reports of other Chaplains of gaols, all confirmatory of the *brutal state of ignorance* exhibited by almost all the offenders who come under their observation.”\*

Such is the case, the appalling, the irresistible case, made out by the two Noble Lords and their official organ, on which they demand of Parliament funds to enable them to improve the state of primary Education amongst us. But what shall we say, when, on seeking to find a remedy for so much crime and misery in a new scheme of Public Education, these very Noble Lords object to found their scheme on what they themselves believe to be the true Religion—on what their Sovereign has sworn to maintain, to the utmost of her power, as the true Religion,—and object to do so, lest, forsooth, by doing it they should violate the rights of conscience, and “ the principles of civil and religious liberty ?” If

\* Recent Measures, p. 13.

such an objection were made, on such an occasion, by ordinary men, it would be difficult to avoid asking, whether it proceeded from hypocrisy or from folly. But, coming from personages in so high place, and of so high qualities, of whom neither hypocrisy nor folly can be suspected, I will adopt the language of one of themselves, and will ask him, in his own words, "is it not a farce to talk of creeds," and the principles of religious liberty, "in connexion with persons so very "ignorant"—the very stress of whose case it is, that they have no creed, no preference for any Religion, not knowledge of any religious or moral truth?

On this point let me again refer to the testimony of the Lord President, given to us in the very same speech: "Who will venture to say," his Lordship demands; "that if schools for general, moral, and religious instruction had been established in Manchester, in Liverpool, in Bury, in Salford, in Birmingham, and in our other large commercial and manufacturing towns, the great feeders of our penal colonies; and that if the population of those districts had been trained in those schools in good moral and religious principles, *no matter whether those principles were those of the Church of England, or of some sect dissenting from it*,—who, I ask, will venture to say, that many might not have escaped from their present "cruel fate?"

After this, I may appear to be doing injustice to the Noble Lord, if, by adding a single word, I seem to intimate a doubt, whether he will be ready to act on his own heart-stirring appeal to the feelings and judgment of others—whether he will take measures to secure to the working classes in those vast receptacles of debased

\* Lord Lansdowne's Speech, p. 17.

humanity—those great “feeders of our penal colonies,”—the very boon which he claims for them as their due—the very remedy which he himself prescribes, as alone able to recover them from that state of moral putrefaction which he so eloquently depicts—whether, in short, he will give them schools, in which their children shall be “trained in good moral and religious principles.” The Lord President says, “no matter whether those principles be the principles of the Church of England, or of some sect dissenting from it.” Why, then, if he thinks it “no matter” which is taken, it is not too much to ask, that he give the measuring-cast to his own Church, particularly, as the oath of his Royal Mistress, and the law of the land, happen to be make-weights in the same scale. If he refuse, it will require all our accustomed respect for him to keep down a rising suspicion that neither the rights nor the wrongs of the poor, nor public morality, nor national honour, no, nor national safety, has so large a share of his regards, as the political influence of certain parties, who might object to purchasing even the deliverance of their country at the price of doing justice to the Church.

Will any one deny the correctness of the picture, drawn by the Noble Marquis, of the moral condition of many parts of the manufacturing districts—of their Heathenism—nay, worse than Heathenism,\* (for Heathens are commonly under some moral influences, which tame and humanize them)? Or will any one dispute about the cause, to which this hideous state of things is to be attributed? We have another witness attesting the same or similar facts, and telling us what is the

\* Mr. Alison's Evidence (No. 2418, &c.) shows a state of morals in Glasgow, from which Heathens would turn with disgust. Have we a right to hope that matters are better in all of our English manufacturing towns?



cause—that it is *the exclusion of the Church* from those districts, or its most inadequate establishment within them, which has mainly caused the evils and dangers which we all deplore. Lord John Russell is that witness: on a very recent occasion, he not only confirmed and enforced his Noble Colleague's statement, but founded on it a demand, which nothing short of stern and irresistible necessity could have wrung from him. On the 2nd of August last, he came down to the House of Commons, and demanded a large increase of the army to meet and avert the dangers, which the “not only lamentable, but appalling” condition of the manufacturing population threatened.

And to what did he ascribe that condition?—To a state of society “which had not the usual concomitants of a densely-peopled region—without sufficient means of instruction, without sufficient places of worship.” *It had not schools, it had not churches.\**

\* In fearful confirmation of the Noble Lord's statement, I subjoin the following Abstract, compiled from the Second Report of the Church Commission (ordered to be printed, March 10, 1836).

P. 6.	In London and its suburbs, there are 34 parishes or districts, with a population amounting to....	Souls. 1,137,000
P. 6.	In the Diocese of Chester, (or rather in Lancashire alone) there are 38 parishes or districts, containing an aggregate of.....	816,000
P. 7.	In the Diocese of York, there are 20 parishes or districts, with an aggregate of.....	402,000
P. 7.	In the Diocese of Lichfield and Coventry, there are 16 parishes or districts, with an aggregate of ...	235,000
		<hr/> 2,590,000 <hr/>

Pp. 6, 7. The amount of Church-room provided for the above, including the Sittings in Proprietary Chapels (many of which have no particular districts assigned to them, and in which, therefore, the parochial economy of the Established Church cannot be carried into full effect), is 301,382 Sittings.

Computing, as do the Committee of the Metropolis Church Fund, (a) that one-half of the population are able to attend public worship, provi-

(a) See their Second Report, page 9.

To meet the pressing danger, the House voted an increase of more than 5000 men, at a permanent cost of 140,000*l.* or 150,000*l.* per annum, enough to maintain 500 or 600 ministers of God's Word—Heralds of the Gospel of Peace! How much more must follow, is known only to Him, whose vengeance does not always sleep. Meanwhile, "our sin has found us out." Happily, it is not only a sin, but, what statesmen are more ashamed of, it is also a blunder. For, even as a question of finance and police, we have now learned, that it is safer, ay, and cheaper, to do our duty to God, and to our poor countrymen. "A population without the usual concomitants of a densely-peopled region—without sufficient means of instruction—without sufficient places of worship!" Whose fault is that? Not the special fault of the noble Lord and of his colleagues;—it is the fault of almost all the Governments, and of all the people of this land, during the last half-century. But whose will be the fault, whose will be the sin, if immediate measures are not taken to redress the enormous wrongs which our national avarice—called by politicians "our social system"—has inflicted upon the bodies, and alas! upon the souls, of hundreds of thousands of our fellow-countrymen? Can they be redressed by a system which disclaims for the Government any duty beyond promoting the "grand object of secular improvement"—nay, whose commissioned expositor proclaims that "the *sole* means" of redressing our moral evils, is, to make those guilty, but most injured men, not Christians, but political economists? In the name of outraged reason, let us implore the Noble Lords, sion is here made for 602,762. This is the number for which provision of Church-room is made, leaving unprovided 1,987,238.

If there be (which is an extravagant supposition) as large provision in Dissenting places of worship, even thus there will remain 1,384,476 *souls* (a word which alone speaks volumes to a Christian) in 108 out of 13,000 parishes, without access to the ordinary means of grace!

and the other Members of the Committee, who are charged with the high trust of dispensing the grant of Parliament for the education of the people, to cast off the trammels of a godless and heartless theory—to take counsel, not from the bigots of liberalism, but from their own feelings, their own principles, their own fear of God, and love of man. Let them stand forth, as they ought, the friends of the poor, the followers of their Redeemer, the deliverers of their country.

Be this as it may, enough within the last few months has been seen and heard to render a repetition of much of by-gone sophistry and misrepresentation impossible. Henceforth, no statesman will rise in his place in Parliament—no man who values his reputation for veracity will stand forth without a mask, and say, or insinuate, that it is the Church, the exclusive spirit, the tyrannous pretensions, the sordid claims, of the Church—~~for~~ as it is more cunningly worded, “the feuds of sects, and the interests of bodies incompetent effectually to deal with the national question;”—no man in the light of day will give utterance to the assertion, that this it is which arrests the march of moral improvement amongst us, and robs the people of England of the heritage which the Government, after periods of ruinous deprivation, was about to restore to them.” No man will venture to put his name to this, or to a charge still more atrocious than this—a charge as yet muttered only, not pronounced—that the Church, by perpetuating that wide-spread and demoralizing ignorance which paralyses all the healthful influences of society, if it does not convert its elements into engines of mutual destruction,” has placed England under a worse than Popish interdict—for, “if marriages could no longer be celebrated, if the dead were left unburied, and the Churches closed,” it were no greater grievance, than

the Church of England now inflicts by her obstinate assertion of her exclusive privileges? No man, I repeat, will venture to put his name to this shameless insinuation. No! It is a foul and wicked calumny, which none but an anonymous libeller would dare to put forth. Such a one has put it forth, and under very high sanction. Clad in the mantle of official authority, bearing on his vizar the stamp of the "Committee on Public Education"—employed "on Her Majesty's Service"—and vouched for by the Seal of the "Privy Council" itself—thus accoutred, thus accredited, he has gone to his unhallowed work,—in the name of the Lord President of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council,—of the Lord Keeper of Her Majesty's Privy Seal,—of one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State,—of the late and present Chancellors of Her Majesty's Exchequer,—of the Master of Her Majesty's Mint,—and lastly of Her Majesty's Judge Advocate!

All this ought to be incredible. Alas! it is only the latest (God grant it may be the last) outrage committed on His Church, under the authority of those, whose most sacred duty it is to maintain and protect that Church to the utmost of their own and of their Sovereign's power.

My friends, my brethren, I have dwelt at greater length, and with more warmth, on this subject *here*, than the time or the place permitted when I addressed you in person. But, "is there not a cause?" For myself, in the deep of my heart, I believe, that on this question of "Public Education"—on the principles which the nation shall now recognise and adopt, as the basis of instruction—ay, and on the agencies which it

shall employ for superintending the work—depend mainly the future spiritual and moral character of the English people; and, by consequence (let political economists think of it as they may), the strength and security of the British Empire. In this great, this holy cause, we, the clergy, are bound, by every consideration of personal responsibility and ministerial faithfulness, to be up and stirring—to be jealous for God's honour—to prove ourselves in earnest, and anxious for the souls of men. We must show to all the world that we indeed “have in remembrance into how high a dignity, “and to how weighty an office and charge, we are called, “to be messengers, *watchmen*, and *stewards of the Lord*.” We may not, we dare not, silently and calmly witness the transfer to others of the most important, the most interesting, the most cheering, because, with God's blessing, the most fruitful, and most effectual part of our pastoral care, the feeding of the lambs of Christ. The great question of the day is, *who shall feed those lambs*; but in it is involved an incalculably greater, with *what food* shall they be fed.

We have lived to hear the world's wisdom superseding, even in this Christian land, the word of God. We have lived to be told that “secular instruction” is the true remedy for that corruption, which adhereth to “every one that is naturally engendered of the offspring of (*Adam*)”—the true security for the individual's virtue, and the nation's greatness. We have lived to hear this monstrous dogma, not whispered, but taught—not taught only in the schools of the infidel, but proclaimed from the highest place, and set forth with the highest sanction. At such a time, our duty is manifest; our path, if not easy, at least is clear. We must not only refuse to give our countenance to the unholy project

still more to bear any part in the execution of it; but we must expose and resist it in every lawful, every honest way. We must raise our voice in respectful, but fearless remonstrance. We must call on our people to give effect to that remonstrance, by the firm, and therefore peaceful, exercise of their own power; warning them, that power carries with it a corresponding duty. Above all, we must "pray always with all prayer and "supplication in the spirit" to our heavenly Master, imploring his gracious support of his own ministers, in what we humbly, but confidently, hope is his own cause. So, with God's blessing, we shall finally exult in seeing the Church and people whom we serve and love, not "spoiled" of their glorious inheritance "through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition "of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after "Christ." Among those who will most rejoice in our success, will be some (let us hope, all) of them, who are now most prominent in the work which we deplore.

I am unwilling to mix with matter of so high public interest anything which concerns myself. But it is part of the public question to illustrate the character of the official pamphlet to which I have so frequently referred. In it,\* I am cited as having in the House of Lords declared my assent to the principle, that the duty of the State is limited to the care of "secular instruction," as contradistinguished from "spiritual and religious." It is added, "upon the principle thus elucidated by the discussions in Parliament, we trust "that all parties are now agreed." With hardihood, or oscitancy, not often witnessed, the writer professes to find the evidence of his assertion in a speech of mine,

\* Recent Measures, p. 56.

the whole tenor of which most explicitly and strongly affirmed the contrary principle.\*

There is another case, illustrative of the authority of that Publication in a question of fact, which I must not omit to notice, more especially, as it is connected with an unfortunate, but mischievous misapprehension, which has been exhibited in another quarter.

At pp. 69—74, it is stated, that in the Regulations contained in the Minute of the Committee of Privy Council of 11th April, 1839, (one of which was, that “Religious Instruction be considered as *general* and “*special*,”) “the views of the Committee appear in all their leading features to be so strictly in accordance with those of that able and pious Prelate, Daniel Wilson, the Bishop of Calcutta, as developed in regulations which he proposed to the Committee of the Martinière, that they feel bound to state the most material parts of those regulations.”

Now, from this, any man of plain understanding must conclude, that the Bishop of Calcutta “proposed those regulations,” according to his own “views” of what was best and fittest for the occasion. This is made stronger by what follows :—

“It was the wish of the Bishop of Calcutta to have founded this institution on the express doctrines and discipline of the Church of England, only ; but, finding that the intentions of the founder were, that the benefits of the institution should be extended to all persons, without distinction of Creed, *he proposed, and strenuously advocated, the plan described in the “Report.”*”

\* This gave rise to a correspondence with Lord J. Russell, which I have much pleasure in placing in the Appendix, No. I.

Such is the statement in the Committee's Pamphlet. But what is the fact?—Bishop Daniel Wilson, in whose praises I gladly concur with these writers, was associated with twelve other Governors in the management of the new Institution, called, from its founder, General Martin, *La Martinière*. It had long been fully understood, that the Institution should be conducted on the principles of the Church of England, and, especially, that no Minister of any other Church, or Religious denomination, should be admitted to its government. But, soon after the arrival of Mr. Macaulay in Bengal, two vacancies, which had occurred in the list of Governors, were filled by the appointment (contrary to the strong reclamation of the Bishop) of the Rev. Dr. St. Leger, an Irish Roman Catholic Vicar Apostolic of the Pope, and the Rev. James Charles, Chaplain of the Scotch Presbyterian Establishment. This took place in May, 1835,—and, in the following month, a proposition was submitted to the Governors for their approbation, containing a body of rules, by which no Clergyman was to be Master or Teacher of the School, and no Religious Instruction was to be allowed to be given in it, *except on such points as were not controverted among Christians*, reserving all special instruction to be given out of school-hours by Clergymen of the Church of England, or Ministers of some other Communion. It was, in short, to be similar to the Irish Government-School system, and to that which was laid down in a despatch from the Colonial Secretary, for all schools in Australia, which are maintained at the public charge: “Limiting the daily and ordinary “Religious Instruction to *those leading doctrines of Christianity*, and those practical precepts, *in which “all Christians may cordially agree.”\**

\* Lord Glenelg's Despatch to Sir R. Bourke, 30th Nov. 1835, p. 16.



Here we have the "general religious instruction" indicated in the Minute of the Committee of 11th of April, 1839; "whose views in all their leading features appear to be so strictly in accordance with those of the Bishop of Calcutta, as developed in the regulations which he proposed."

Let us next see how the Bishop proved his accordance with these views of the Committee. He began by giving his warm resistance to the proposition, which would have carried this very plan of "general religious instruction" into effect. He addressed a letter to Sir C. T. Metcalfe, Governor-General of Bengal, who was also President of the Governors of La Martinière—in which letter he argued against the proposition, as contrary to all right principle and experience; as well as to the intention of the founder and the Decree of the Court. This letter, though it failed to obtain the votes of the majority of his colleagues, seven of whom (against six) supported the proposition, was yet too powerful to be disregarded; it did not prevent the passing of the proposition, but it stopped the execution of it. A compromise took place; and the lowest terms to which the Bishop, after claiming much higher, could be induced to accede, and which, after much discussion between himself, Dr. St. Leger, and Mr. Charles, were finally adopted, are those which are exhibited in the Committee's Pamphlet.

Such is the foundation for the assertion, that the Bishop of Calcutta's "views" are those which are "developed in these regulations—which he proposed," and strenuously "advocated;" but of which he thus writes himself in "his own vindication," to which the Pamphlet refers:

"I think it right in justice to the Indian Episcopal Church, to observe, that I laboured strenuously to have the foundation of this institution laid on the

“express doctrines and discipline of the Church of  
 “England only; but, failing in this, *I succeeded with*  
 “*great difficulty in preventing what is termed the*  
 “*Irish Government School System from being adopted,*  
 “and in establishing *in its stead* all the great doctrines  
 “of redemption, as held by the five main divisions of the  
 “Christian world—the English, the Scotch, the Roman  
 “Catholic, the Greek, and the Armenian Churches—  
 “as our fundamental principles.”

Now, I may be permitted to ask, whether the  
 “general religious instruction” of the Committee be  
 not the same, or virtually the same, as that very  
 “Irish Government School System,” which the Bishop  
 declares that “he succeeded with great difficulty in  
 “preventing from being adopted?”

Be this as it may, are the regulations of La Mar-  
 tinère (however they may have originated) such as are  
 “in accordance with the views of the Committee on  
 “Education?” Will the Committee adopt those regu-  
 lations? In other words, will they say, that the “ge-  
 “neral religious instruction,” in every school which  
 they will support or acknowledge, shall comprise  
 “The Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures—the mystery  
 “of the adorable Trinity—the Deity, Incarnation,  
 “Atonement, and Intercession of our Lord and Saviour  
 “Jesus Christ—the Personality and Deity of the Holy  
 “Spirit, and His operations and grace in the sancti-  
 “fication of man—the indispensable obligation of  
 “repentance towards God, faith in Christ, and con-  
 “tinual prayer for the grace of the Holy Spirit—the  
 “moral duties summed up in the Ten Commandments,  
 “and enlarged upon in other parts of the Holy Scrip-  
 “tures—all based on the doctrines above specified,  
 “and enforced as their proper fruits?”

Will the Committee adopt all these articles, which

are expressly stated in the "Regulations"—and with them what is further added in the "catechetical form adapted to the capacities of Children"—especially, Regeneration in Baptism?—If they will, we shall heartily rejoice to find, that their liberality is not of so latitudinarian a character as we apprehended: we shall rejoice to find, that their highest views of what is requisite in "general Religious Instruction," rise to a level with the lowest views of Bishop Daniel Wilson.

But if they will not—as no man doubts that they will not—what must be said of their official and authorized writer, who, professing to give "a plain exposition of the Committee's principles," dares to state them to be "strictly in accordance with those of that able and pious Prelate, as developed in the very regulations," which they would refuse to accept?

---

From these matters of general concern to all true Churchmen, I turn to others more especially interesting us of the Clergy.

Since we last met, not many Acts have passed the Legislature, having particular reference to the Church. The most important was the Statute of last year "to abridge the holding of Benefices in Plurality, and to make better provision for the Residence of the Clergy." I heartily hope that the first most desirable object may prove to have been accomplished with little of the practical inconvenience, which it seems not easy wholly to prevent accompanying it.

The other part of the Statute, relating to the residence of the Clergy, you will, I hope, agree with me in thinking excellently well adapted to attain its proposed end, in a manner as little vexatious as possible. By it, you are released from all danger of encounter with the

common informer; you are protected, too, from the interference of private malice; and are placed under regulations simple and intelligible, to be enforced by one whose feelings can hardly be imagined to be adverse to a fair and liberal and lenient exercise of the powers intrusted to him. Among the excellent provisions of this Statute may be reckoned, especially, the facility afforded to the erection of Parsonage Houses,—and the power of assigning any house within the parish, or at a reasonable distance from it, to be the legal house of residence, in cases where the want of a fit and convenient house might else have subjected the party to penalties, or the Church to the scandal of seeming to tolerate non-residence, even where all the duties of residence are most efficiently performed.

Another measure has been brought into Parliament, both in this and in the last Session, of which I am unwilling here to say much—the Bill on Church Discipline. It was introduced with the concurrence of the highest authority in the Church—of one to whom I would largely defer in all things relative to the Church, on which it is allowable to defer to any human authority. But this Bill involved (as I think) principles too sacred to be surrendered. In my opposition to it, your general and warm co-operation nobly and effectually sustained me. Accept my heartiest thanks for the zeal and promptitude with which it was given. I needed not, I hope, that encouragement, to make me persevere in a course, which inclination and duty have, from the first, alike prompted me to pursue, of always communicating with you on every subject—especially on every legislative measure—which materially affects the interests either of yourselves, or of the Church.

Such communication seems to me to be strictly due to you, under the present mode of legislating for the Church; by which the great body of the Clergy are excluded from all direct power of interference whatsoever—much, I think, to the injury of the Church, and even to the weakening of the just influence of the Bishops themselves. For, the practice of debating questions involving the essential principles of Ecclesiastical polity, among those who cannot be expected to estimate duly, nor even to understand accurately, those principles themselves, but who have yet, each of them, a voice, as potential and absolute as any of those who are most conversant with such questions, cannot fail to lead to conclusions sometimes disastrous, sometimes almost ludicrous. If a Council of War were held in a Synod of Clergy, and the Reverend Assessors were not only to vote in common with the most skilful generals on the conduct of a campaign, but were even enabled, by their vast plurality of voices, to drown the suffrages of the military portion of the Council, the case would be not more incongruous, nor the results more likely to be pernicious, than for the Bench of Bishops to argue a question involving the most sacred principles of the Constitution of the Church, in an assembly of men, however able, who never before thought, or even heard, of the high matters submitted to their decision. In either case, some of the hearers, it is probable, there would always be, who would seek the hazardous distinction of judging between the disputants, and pronouncing peremptorily on subjects on which they “understand not what they say, nor whereof they affirm.” But the great body would choose the wiser part, and vote in deference to those to whom they give their confidence; and thus the amount of the majority of suffrages would indicate, not the prepon-

derance of argument, but only the comparative authority of different individuals, or even of the different stations occupied by those individuals. In the present instance, we have seen a Bill of vast importance to the Church carried by triumphant majorities through the Upper House of Parliament, yet so undeniably faulty and defective, that its very authors and advocates dared not suffer it to become a law. Could this have happened, if the principles and provisions of the Bill had been first submitted to the judgment of an assembly adequately representing the whole body of the Clergy, and thus enabled to give to the result of their deliberations the authority of the Church at large?

For myself, therefore, I repeat, that so long as Parliament is called upon, not to give or to withhold (as it has a right to do) its sanction to the decisions of the Church, but to decide for the Church, on questions which the Church alone is competent to discuss, I shall feel it my duty to seek the judgment of my Clergy, in the best manner in which it can be obtained, and to represent that judgment to Parliament. And this I shall do, not merely in justice to my Clergy, who have a right to be heard on all such questions; but, still more, for my own sake, who am thus enabled to speak with an authority which my solitary judgment could never possess; and, above all, for the sake and for the instruction of Parliament itself, which cannot wisely set at nought the counsels of an enlightened and conscientious body of men, speaking on a subject on which their studies and habits have peculiarly qualified them to advise. Were this practice followed universally, it would afford some, however inadequate, compensation for the want of an authorised and authoritative assembly of the Clergy at large. On the late occasion, yours were not the only Petitions received. From not fewer than two-and-twenty Dioceses, Petitions were presented against the Bill—

almost all of them deprecating it as inconsistent with the Constitution of the Church—and not one on the other side. What weight was given to these Petitions in the deliberations of the supporters of the Bill, as they did not state, it is not for me to conjecture. But I am grieved to add, that I have received an authoritative intimation, that “ a Bill, which will probably be the same “ as to its leading provisions, *will be brought into the “ House of Lords on the very first day of the next “ Session, and pressed on with all practicable speed.*”

This intimation was given to me, in consequence of my having remonstrated on the seeming intention of carrying the Bill through the House of Commons, at the end of the last Session, in defiance of a pledge, voluntarily given in the House of Lords, that, if the Bill were read a third time in this House, opportunity would be given to the Clergy at large of considering the measure before the next Session, when a new Bill should be introduced, in preparing of which the assistance of those most opposed on principle to the late Bill should be invited. The correspondence which passed on that occasion I read to some of you, when acknowledging an Address which they were pleased to present to me ; and I now deem it right to place it before all. I, at the same time, submit to you the heads of a Bill which I wish to present to Parliament on the day on which the other shall be presented ; after it shall have received such improvements as may be suggested, either by you, or by any others of the Clergy, who shall think fit to give me the benefit of their judgment on this very important subject.\*

---

In the course of the last few years, it has been gra-

\* The Correspondence and the Heads of the proposed Bill are given in Appendix, No. II.

tifying to observe, particularly in the younger portion of the Clergy, a manifest and great increase of zeal in the prosecution of theological studies. If this improvement has not been unattended with evil, it is no more than the constant experience of man's infirmity might prepare us to expect. Be the amount, however, of that evil stated as largely as it may—be the excesses, to which opinions on either side of any of the disputed points have been carried, as wide of the truth as each shall in turn represent the sentiments of his adversary to be—still I congratulate you and the Church on the impulse thus given to those studies, to which our Ordination Vow has especially pledged us all.

This is not an occasion, on which a discussion of any of these disputed questions could be advantageously, because it must be inadequately, pursued. But you have a right to expect from me some declaration of my sentiments on the principal matters which have been brought into dispute, especially on those which have an important bearing, either on the authority of your Ministry, or on the tone and character of your Ministrations.

First, then, for the great question of the very foundation and origin of your ministerial charge: Do you derive it in regular succession from those who were invested with it, and with the power of transmitting it, by the great Head of the Church? or is it merely an ordinance of policy and convenience, which the Church created, and may at pleasure relinquish and renew, according to the varying exigences of times and seasons? Is it, in short, the institution of God, or of man?

I will not argue the question, though the decision by argument would not seem to me difficult; but I will rather remind you of the solemn declaration which you have made, and the pledges which you have given, on



this great point. I address you, in short, as Ministers of Christ's Church in England. As such, you have all solemnly declared your adherence to the Articles of the Church; and not to them only, but also to its Liturgy and its Ordinal. Now I cannot conceive how any ingenuous and conscientious mind can either enter into such an engagement, or can continue to hold stations, for which that engagement is an indispensable qualification, unless he believe in the *Divine* authority of the commission which he holds; and, by consequence, the unbroken transmission of it from, and by, those who first received it.

The 26th Article expressly affirms this as the reason why the effect of the "Ministration of the Word and Sacrament" depends not on the worthiness of the Ministers; "*forasmuch* as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by his Commission and Authority." And how is this Authority given? Read the answer to this question in the Preface to the Form and Manner of "making, ordaining, and consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, according to the Order of the Church of England." To the truth of this, and of all things else contained in that Book, and of their full agreement with the Word of God, you have all repeatedly subscribed. Read there, that "it is evident to all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons"; that no man might presume to execute any of them, except, "having been first called, tried, examined, he were also by public prayer, with imposition of hands, approved and admitted thereunto by lawful authority," all and

*Of Imposition of Hands*, here declared to be necessary

to valid Ordination, it is not easy to conceive why the Church should thus declare it to be *necessary*, unless because it holds, in common with all acknowledged branches of the Catholic Church to the time of the Reformation, that the same *form of Ordination*—in other words, of giving the Holy Ghost for the offices of the Christian Ministry,—which was observed by the Apostles themselves, was also, under the direction of the Holy Ghost, transmitted by them for the perpetual observance of the Church, in admitting to the same Holy Orders, which they themselves conferred.

And as to the “lawful authority” spoken of in the same sentence, it is manifestly implied in what follows, that it resides in Bishops, and in none but Bishops. For the Church there speaks of all as *lawful* Bishops, Priests, or Deacons, who are consecrated or ordained according to its own form, or “who have had formerly *Episcopal* Ordination or Consecration;” and none other.

Is it still doubtful, whether it be, according to the teaching of our Church, by *Divine* institution, that Bishops hold this power of conferring the commission on others? Refer to the Office of Consecration of Bishops—read there the Charge to the Congregation—“first to ‘fall to prayer’ before the Archbishop ‘admits and ‘*sends forth* the person presented unto him, to the ‘work, whereunto he trusts the Holy Ghost hath called ‘him.” Mark, that they are required to do this “following the *example of our Saviour Christ*,” the example which was set by him “before *He* did choose ‘and send forth his twelve Apostles.” Attend, next, to the prayer of the Archbishop to “Almighty God, the ‘Giver of all good things, who by His Holy Spirit hath ‘appointed divers orders of Ministers in his Church,” that He will “mercifully behold this His servant now ‘called to the work and ministry of a Bishop.”

Can the most captious ingenuity still suggest escape from the conclusion, that the doctrine of our Church implies a full acknowledgment of the Divine authority of such a commission? Read the form of words solemnly pronounced by the Archbishop, when he and the Assistant Bishops lay their hands upon the head of the elected Bishop.

“Receive the Holy Ghost, for the office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands; in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. And remember that thou stir up the grace of God, which is given thee by the imposition of our hands.” The very words (as I scarcely need remind you) in which Paul speaks of his own consecration of Timothy.\*

After this, turn to the Gospels appropriated to the service, and first to that from the 20th Chapter of St. John: “Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you. *As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.* And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.” Or read the other lesson from St. Matthew's Gospel; in which our Lord commissions and empowers his Apostles, not only to admit subjects into his kingdom, members into his Church, but also to teach and govern the Church, promising his perpetual presence with them. “Lo! I am with you always, even to the end of the world.” Is it conceivable, that the Church, in selecting this passage of Scripture to be read on this occasion, did not mean by it to signify, that the promise was to be fulfilled by Christ's pre-

\* 2 Tim. i. 6.

sence with them, the successors of the Apostles, to the end of the world?

In like manner, look to the Ordering of Priests. Read there, that those who receive the Order of Priesthood, "also receive" also "the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest, committed unto them by the imposition of the Bishop's hands."

Lastly, direct your attention to the other Order of the Christian Ministry. You will see "authority to execute the office of a Deacon committed to" him who receives it, "by the Bishop, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Now, I argue not (for the present, I repeat, is not an occasion for arguing) whether these several formularies be, or be not, sound, legitimate, Scriptural; but I ask, whether they who have, again and again, subscribed to this Book, as "lawful," as "containing nothing contrary to the Word of God;" who have also subscribed to the 36th Article, which says of this same Book, not only that "it doth contain all things necessary to such Consecration and Ordering," but that "neither hath it anything that, of itself, is superstitious and ungodly" (as much of it must be considered to be, if the commission of the Ordered Ministers be not, indeed, from God);—who have even voluntarily received their own Commission in the very form therein prescribed;—can they, I ask, without the most shameful disingenuousness, deny, that it is the doctrine of our Church, at least,—be that doctrine true or untrue,—that its Ministers receive their Commission from those who have themselves received authority to confer it in succession from the Apostles, and, through them, from our Lord himself?

If any think that this doctrine is erroneous;—if, after using all the means of information which God has

placed within his power,—above all, humble prayer to God for His Spirit to guide and guard him in the investigation;—if, after this, he have convinced himself, or have been convinced by others, since he subscribed to the doctrine,—that it is contrary to God's Word, that the ministerial commission is of human origin, and confers no higher than human authority;—in the name of God, let him no longer continue to exercise it. We would mourn for his loss; we would honour his sincerity; we would wish him all joy and peace in acting as his conscience dictates. But if, continuing to call himself a Minister of God in the English branch of the Catholic Church,—continuing to hold any station of trust and emolument in it,—he yet presumes to decry the Divine authority of its Ministry, and to slander and vilify those who uphold it, no words of man can exaggerate his baseness.\*

Another, and a kindred question, is that which relates to the doctrine of the Christian SACRAMENTS.

On this subject, we have rather to complain of the vague and indistinct, and therefore too often depreciating tone, in which the Sacraments are spoken of, than to oppose ourselves to the direct denial of their spiritual efficacy. Such denial would be so glaringly opposed to the most express and solemn declarations of our Church, that no man can well call himself a member of it, and join in denying its known doctrine, that the Sacraments are not mere signs, but also effectual means

\*A printed letter, addressed to me, with the name of the Rev. Mr. Head, Rector of Feniton, as its author, assumed that this passage was designed to apply specially to him. It can hardly be necessary for me to tell my Clergy, that I should not make a Visitation Charge the vehicle of particular remark on any one of them. In respect to Mr. Head, I had never seen any publication of his on the subject; nor, until thus reminded of it, did I recollect that I had heard he had written on it, and had been ably answered. Of all particulars I was utterly unaware.

of grace. But then we have to lament, that many, content with barely assenting to this truth in its most naked and abstract form, permit themselves virtually to rob the Sacraments of their full, great, and practical efficiency.

Here too, without arguing on the controverted points, I shall content myself with reminding you of the extent to which our Church carries its doctrine, and therefore of the extent in which we, every one of us, have repeatedly and solemnly declared that we hold it.

And first, of the two Sacraments, (specially so called,) it maintains that they are “*generally necessary to salvation*:” that they are “sure witnesses, and effectual means of grace, and of God’s good-will towards us, by which he doth work invisibly in us,” imparting the vital grace of Christ to us, “and doth not only “quicken,” as in the one Sacrament, “but also,” as in the other, “strengthen and confirm, our faith in him.” They are “outward and visible signs of inward and “spiritual grace given unto us”—they were “ordained “by our Lord himself,” as “means whereby we receive” that spiritual grace, and “pledges to assure us,” that, invisible and spiritual as the grace given in either of them is, we do yet actually receive it, when we rightly receive the Sacrament which sets it forth.

To come to particulars. Of BAPTISM, our Church teaches, that the inward grace, of which it is not only the sign, but the “sure witness,” and the “effectual “mean” of conveyance, is “a death unto sin, and a new “birth unto righteousness;” that in and by Baptism Regeneration is given unto us.

In the ninth Article, the word *renatis*, in the Latin copy, is, in the English, *baptized*—both copies being,

as you know, equally original. Surely, this alone is sufficient to prove, that our Church considers the being *baptized* as the same as being *regenerate*; for it uses the very terms as convertible.

Accordingly, it teaches us to apply to Baptism the words spoken by our Lord to Nicodemus; for, in the Exhortation in the Office of "Baptism of such as are of "riper years," it tells us, that, by the express words of our Saviour Christ, "except a man be born of water "and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of "God," "*we may perceive the great necessity* of this "Sacrament, where it may be had"—in other words, that without it, where it may be had, "we cannot enter "into the Kingdom of God."

Whether, where Baptism may not be had, God is ever pleased to give Regeneration, as Scripture is silent, so likewise is the Church. A charitable hope, in such a case, it does not discourage, but neither doth it require. It leaves us to draw our own conclusion from the analogy of the Gospel of love, and peace, and mercy.

Of *Infant* Baptism, the Church further tells us, that "it is certain, by God's Word, that children which are "baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are "undoubtedly saved." It tells us, too, that every baptized "infant is regenerate and grafted into the body of "Christ's Church;" nay, it teaches and commands us to "yield hearty thanks" to Almighty God, as a "most "Merciful Father, for having been pleased thus to regenerate" him, for "having received him for his own "child by adoption," for "having incorporated him into "His Holy Church."

That any one, after having again and again solemnly subscribed to the lawfulness, and therefore to the truth, of all this—after having engaged before God and man, that he will use this form of words in administering

Baptism—and after having, in accordance with that engagement, continued to use it during the whole of his ministerial service—can yet deny or dispute the position that our Church maintains, that always to infants, and to adults rightly receiving, regeneration is given in Baptism, and, so far as man is authorized to pronounce, in Baptism only,—might appear incredible, if the experience of more than 200 years had not, unhappily, furnished us with too many instances to the contrary. Our own times, indeed, and I must not forbear to add, our own Diocese, have been said to furnish more than one instance of disingenuousness of another kind. It is reported, (erroneously, I hope,) that there are persons, even among our Brethren, who, in despite of their engagements, take upon themselves to omit, or garble, portions of the Office of Baptism, in order to avoid expressions, which their conscience, it should seem, is too tender to use, though not too tender to promise to use.

Whether the penalties of human law be likely to restrain any who in such a matter can set at nought their most sacred obligations to God, I know not; but it may be well to state the injunction of the Thirty-eighth Canon: “If any Minister, after he has subscribed, shall omit to use the form of prayer, or any of the orders, prescribed in the Communion, let him be suspended; and if, after a month, he do not reform and submit himself, let him be excommunicated; and then, if he shall not submit himself within the space of another month, let him be deposed from the ministry.” The penalties of this Canon I should feel it my duty, however painful, to enforce, in any case in which by due proof it may be shown that they are incurred.\*

\* The printed letter, bearing Mr. Head’s name, having professed that he thus corrupts the office of Baptism, I called on him at my Visitation, in the presence of the Archdeacon, and the Churchwardens of his



And here, I cannot forbear entreating you all to follow the directions of the Rubric, as in other respects, so particularly in relation to the *time* of administering Baptism, “either immediately after the Second Lesson “ at Morning Prayer, or else immediately after the Second Lesson at Evening Prayer.”

Those of your congregation, who know and consider what Baptism is—a sacrament—a holy mystery, instituted and ordained by our Lord himself, in which He is in a special manner present, and by which He worketh a new creation in the soul of him who receives it, making him to be part of his own body, and so to be entitled to an inheritance in his Heavenly Kingdom—all, I say, who know and consider this (as all ought to know and consider it), however often Baptism may recur, will witness it with awe, and reverence, and holy joy; and will join most gladly in the prayers and praises, which are offered up to God, at the working of so mighty a change in any one of those for whom our Saviour shed his blood. Nor would it be easy to devise any means more likely to be effectual, in awakening the thoughtless, or enlightening the ignorant, than thus to remind them, by the Baptism of others, both of the new birth which was once vouchsafed to themselves, and of the new life to which they were thereby pledged. But then, in order to insure these good effects, it is manifestly necessary, that you should not seldom bring the real nature and blessed efficacy of this Sacrament to the attention of your people.

parish, to avow himself, if he thought fit, the Author of the letter (cautioning him that the avowal might be used against him). As he declined making this avowal, I charged the Churchwardens to note his practice in ministering Baptism, and to make Presentment, if he omits any portion of the Office.

Let me now say a few words of the other Sacrament :—

When any of us speak of this great mystery in terms best suited to its high spiritual nature ; when, for instance, we speak of the *real presence* of Christ's body and blood in the HOLY EUCHARIST, there is raised a cry, as if we were symbolizing with the Church of Rome, and as if this presence, because it is real, can be nothing else than the gross carnal corporeal presence indicated in the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Now here, as with respect to Baptism, I will not argue the point, but will merely refer to the language of our Church in those authorized declarations of its doctrine to which we have assented, and in those formularies which we have both expressly approved and solemnly engaged to use.

It is very true, that none of these declarations or formularies use the phrase " real presence ;" and therefore, if any should attempt to impose the use of that phrase as necessary, he would be justly open to censure for requiring what the Church does not require. But, on the other hand, if we adopt the phrase, as not only aptly expressing the doctrine of the Church, but also as commended to our use by the practice of the soundest divines of the Church of England, in an age more distinguished for depth, as well as soundness, of theology, than the present—such as Archbishops Bramhall,\* Sharp,† and Wake,‡ (all of whom do not only express their own judgment, but also are witnesses of the general judgment of the Church in, and before, their

\* Bramhall's Works, tome i. p. 15.

† Sharp's Sermons, vol. vii. p. 368.

‡ Wake's Discourse on the Holy Eucharist, Chap. 2. " Of the Real Presence acknowledged by the Church of England." " The bread and wine, after consecration, are *the real*, but the *spiritual and mystical* body of Christ."

days; "*No genuine son of the Church of England*," says Bramhall, "*did ever deny a true real presence*") :—if, I say, we adopt the phrase, used by such men as these, and even by some of those, who at the Reformation sealed with their blood their testimony to the Truth against the doctrine of Rome, (I allude especially to Bishops Ridley\* and Latimer—and even to Cranmer, who, when he avoided the phrase, so abused by the Romanists, did yet employ equivalent words.)

\* *Ridley*.—"I say, *the Body of Christ is present* in the Sacraments, but yet sacramentally and spiritually, according to his grace-giving life, and in that respect *really*, that is, according to his Benediction, giving life. The true Church of Christ doth acknowledge a Presence of Christ's Body in the Lord's Supper to be communicated to the godly by grace, and spiritually, as I have often showed, and by a Sacramental signification, but not by the corporeal Presence of the Body of his Flesh."—*Fox, Acts and Monuments*, London, 1684, p. 61.

*Latimer*.—"To the right celebration of the Lord's Supper, there is no other Presence of Christ required, than a spiritual Presence; and this Presence is sufficient for a Christian man, as a presence by which we abide in Christ, and Christ abideth in us, to the obtaining of eternal life if we persevere. And, *this same Presence may be called most fitly a real Presence*, that is, a presence *not feigned*, but a true and faithful presence."—*Ib.* p. 65.

*Cranmer*.—"When I say, and repeat, many times in my Book, that the Body of Christ is present in them that worthily receive the Sacrament, lest any man should mistake my words, and think that I mean that, although Christ be not corporally in the outward visible signs, yet he is corporally in the Persons that duly receive them, this is to advertise the reader, that I mean no such thing. But my meaning is, that, *the force, the grace, the virtue, and benefits of Christ's Body*, that was crucified for us, and of his blood, that was shed for us, be *really and effectually present* with all them that duly receive the Sacrament."—*Preface to his Book against Bishop Gardiner*.

*Cranmer*, in his "Book on the Sacrament," says, after *Chrysostom*, "*In them that rightly receive the bread and wine, Christ is in a much more perfection than corporally* (which should avail them nothing); but *in them he is spiritually*; with his divine powers, giving them the eternal life."—*Fathers of the English Church*, vol. iii. p. 367.

Again, after *John Damascene*: "Unto them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine, to them *the bread and wine be Christ's flesh and blood*: that is, by things natural, and which they be accustomed unto, they be exalted unto things above nature. For, *the sacramental bread and wine be not bare and naked figures*, but so pithy and effectuous, that *whosoever eateth them, eateth spiritually Christ's flesh and blood*."—"Such as by unfeigned faith worthily receive the bread and wine; such persons, through the working of the Holy Spirit, be so knit and united spiritually to Christ's flesh and blood, and to his Divinity likewise, that they be fed with them unto everlasting life."—*Ib.* 474.

it will be sufficient for the justification both of them and of us, to show that the language of the Church itself does in fact express the same thing, though in different terms. Still, I fully admit, that Christian discretion would bid us forbear from the use of the phrase, if the objection to it were founded on a sincere apprehension of giving offence to tender consciences; and not, as there is too much reason to believe, on an aversion to the great truth which it is employed to express.

That truth is, no other than is declared in the Catechism, that “the Body and Blood of Christ are verily, and indeed, taken and received by the Faithful in the Lord’s Supper.” “The Body and Blood of Christ” are “the inward and spiritual grace” of this Sacrament. They must, therefore, be as really, though inwardly and spiritually, present in the Sacrament, as are the bread and wine which are outwardly and sensibly present. Again, in the 28th Article, it is said, “The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner.”

Now this is what is meant by the real presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Communion: in it there is an actual communication to the faithful receivers of the Body and Blood of Christ—not merely as those who depreciate the Sacrament would represent, a memorial or token, by which our minds are directed to the remembrance and contemplation of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby—for this a Picture, or a Crucifix, might be, ay, and better be—(so much more like to Popery is ultra-Protestantism, than the sound doctrine of our Church); but there is, I repeat, in this Sacrament, an actual communication to the faithful of the sacrificed

Body and Blood of Christ, "the true Bread from "Heaven," the true spiritual food, by which "our "souls are strengthened and refreshed, as our bodies "are by bread and wine." This it is, which the Scriptures tell us, he that eateth and drinketh unworthily "discerneth not" in the Lord's Supper; and, because he discerneth it not, "eateth and drinketh "damnation" (or, as the margin expresseth it, "judgment") unto himself.\*

Now let us, I beseech you, often and earnestly impress on our people both the necessity of our partaking of this spiritual food, and also the ground of that necessity. It is implied in that passage of St. Paul to the Corinthians which tells us that, as we have borne the image of the first Adam, so we must bear the image of the second Adam.†

The nature of man we have from Adam, and the corruption of that nature by propagation from Adam. The nature of man Christ had from Adam, but not corruption: for he had not from Adam by propagation; that nature was made incorrupt in him by the union of Deity with it. Incorruption we have from Christ. The Spirit giveth it; but giveth it by Christ's body and blood, which are the elements of our spiritual life: and it is our being united with this his body and blood, that makes us to have incorruption, and all other the blessed "fruit, grace, and efficacy of his Body and Blood."‡

\* 1 Cor. xi. 29.

† 1 Cor. xv. 47 to the end.

‡ See Hooker, Book v., §§ 57 and 67. "Touching the *sentence of antiquity*, in this cause, it is evident how they teach that Christ is personally there present; yea present whole, albeit a part of Christ be corporally absent from thence; that Christ, assisting this heavenly Banquet with his personal and true presence, doth, by his own divine powers, add to the natural substance thereof supernatural efficacy, which addition to the nature of those consecrated elements changeth them, and maketh them that *unto us*, which otherwise they could not be—that to us they are thereby made such instruments, as mystically yet truly,

The Sacraments are the instruments, by which that Union is given. In the holy Eucharist, the consecrated bread and wine being his Body and Blood *in effect*, we are thereby made mystical members of Christ, and he is our Mystical Head.

Let us, I repeat, teach and inculcate these truths. Especially, let us guard our people against an error, which many of the most pious and zealous among them are apt to fall into:—against exalting Faith, to the disparagement of the Sacraments. True Christian Faith, true Christian humbleness of heart and mind, will make us embrace and magnify, with thankful and joyful reverence, those external means of Grace, which Christ himself hath been pleased to institute and to crown with His blessing.

There is another subject, on which I would say a few words, because it also has been, and continues to be, the occasion of much of excitement and uneasiness to many, who sincerely seek, and would gladly acquiesce in, the Truth, on whichever side it be;—I mean, the use of primitive Tradition. Some learned and pious Ministers of our Church claim for it that it not only was a mode of imparting Divine Truth, chosen in the Apostolic Age by the Holy Spirit, before the Canon of Scripture was formed; but also is still continued to the Church,—and that, as such, it demands the attention and reverence of all Christians.

I will not express an opinion on this matter, because, the Church having delivered no judgment upon it, it would be foreign from my present purpose to give any

*invisibly yet really, work our Communion and Fellowship with the Person of Jesus Christ, as well in that he is Man as God, our participation also in the fruit, grace, and efficacy of his Body and Blood.*  
—Hooker's Works, 8vo. vol. ii. p. 336.

of my own ; my sole object being to caution you against adopting false or exaggerated opinions from others.

I need not tell you, that the notion, which I have just stated, has excited the warmest and most clamorous opposition. Those who put it forth are unscrupulously charged with wishing to raise Tradition to equal authority with the Scriptures, though they distinctly declare, that they look to it only as "subsidiary to the Scriptures."\* In spite, however, of every such declaration, the notion is assailed with more than ordinary violence—"Popery," "Heresy," "The awful Oxford Heresy," are among the phrases unreservedly applied to it.

Now, do the persons who use this language consider, or understand, what they say? Do they remember, or do they know, that no private man can, without sinful presumption, pronounce any opinion to be Heresy, until the Church shall have solemnly declared it such? Do they further remember, or do they need to be informed, that it is not every false opinion in Religion which the Church pronounces to be heresy; but only such as is contrary to some article of *the* Faith, or something which by necessary consequence leads to the subversion of some fundamental truth? In the present case, has the Church made any such declaration? Has it either condemned as Heresy, or in any way condemned, the opinion in question? Yes—we shall be told—in its Sixth Article. That Article says, "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to Salvation." Do the

\* "Primitive Tradition recognised by Scripture." A Sermon by the Rev. N. Keble. P. 33.

writers, whose opinion in commendation of Tradition is so fiercely assailed, contradict this? So far from it, they expressly state, that "Scripture is the sole and "paramount rule of faith"\*—that every fundamental point of doctrine is contained in Canonical Scriptures—and that nothing is to be insisted on as an Article of Faith, necessary to Salvation, which is not contained therein.

But, while such is their language, while they may truly thus assert, that they are innocent of violating the Sixth Article, can their accusers say the same of themselves? Are they equally free from the offence which they thus unscrupulously charge upon others? Let us see.

By calling the opinion, which they oppose, heresy, they affirm, by implication, that it is contrary to an article of the faith; in other words, they say, that we are bound to believe as a fundamental article of faith, and therefore of necessity to salvation, that the Holy Spirit did not give Tradition as a permanent mode of imparting Divine truth subsidiary to Scripture. But if they affirm this, they are required by the Sixth Article to adduce proof of their assertion from Scripture,—a task which, I am sure, would be most difficult, which I believe is impracticable, and which has not, so far as I know, been seriously attempted by any one worthy of notice. When it shall have been accomplished, we will join in calling on the Traditionists to renounce their wicked error, or to submit to be branded as "heretics." But, meanwhile, their accusers should beware how they violate not only the Sixth Article of the Church, but also the Ninth Commandment of God. Neither let them forget that the Church itself, in some of its most authoritative formularies, appears, at

\* "Primitive Tradition recognised by Scripture," p. 31.



least, to favour the opinion which they so unsparingly condemn—that Tradition has been given to us as an enduring channel of instruction in Christian Truth, though not as the authority for any necessary doctrine. For instance, what will they say of the Apostles' Creed? Has it not come to us by Tradition; and been adopted by the Church from Tradition? What of the Nicene Creed? Has it not been received on the authority of the first Council of Nice? What of the Athanasian Creed? Is not that, too, from Tradition?

The reading of the Holy Scriptures as part of the Divine Service, and the common prayers in the Church, is again and again recommended to us in the Preface to' the Book of Common Prayer, as having "the first "original and ground thereof" in primitive practice—as "the godly and decent order of the ancient Fathers." Be it remembered, too, that our very Ordination Vow implies, that Scripture *requires* (I do not say, absolutely needs) external aid for its due interpretation: for we thereby engaged, "the Lord being our Helper," to "be diligent," not only "in reading of the Holy "Scriptures," but, also, "in such studies as help to the "knowledge of the same;" and among such studies must not the Traditions of the Fathers hold an important place? A Canon of the Convocation of 1571, which, I need not say, is part of the law of the Church, commands preachers "to be careful never to teach any—"thing in their sermons as if to be religiously held and "believed by the people, but what is agreeable to the "doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and collected "from that very doctrine by the Catholic Fathers and "ancient Bishops."

*After all, let me not be supposed to set myself for-*

ward as the advocate of these writers. They need not the aid of such an advocate, and I will not encumber them with it. I am not even their partisan ; for I am far from subscribing to all they say, and still further from always approving the mode in which they say it.

Thus, on this very subject of Tradition, while I freely acquit them of all approach to heresy, I yet lament to see them give to it so definite and so high a place in the great scheme of God's Revelation of his Will for the recovery of lost mankind. I lament to hear them speak of adherence to " the Bible, and nothing but the " Bible," as " an unthankful rejection of another great " gift, equally from God, such as no true Anglican can " tolerate."—I lament to see them state, as " the " sounder view, that the Bible is the *record* of necessary " truth, or of matters of Faith, and the Church Catho- " lic's Tradition is"—not a most venerable witness, or most useful assistant in interpreting it, but—" *the in- " terpreter of it.*"

Again, while I reject the charge of Popery, applied to them, as being as absurd as it is uncharitable,—I yet cannot but lament, that they sometimes deal with some of the worst corruptions of Rome, in terms not indicating so deep a sense of their pernicious tendency, as yet I doubt not that they feel.

For instance: defending themselves against the charge of leaning towards Popery, they confidently affirm, that " in the seventeenth century the Theology " of the Body of the English Church was substantially " the same as theirs ;"\* and in proof of this, they profess, in stating the errors of Rome, to " follow closely the

\* Tracts for the Times, No. 33, p. 11.

“ order observed by Bishop Hall in his treatise on ‘ the Old Religion,’ ” whose Protestantism, they add, “ is unquestionable,” and is claimed, therefore, as a voucher for their own. But, looking to particulars, I lament to see them “ following, indeed, the *order* of “ Bishop Hall,” but widely departing from his truly Protestant sentiments, on more than one important article.

First, of “ the *worship* of images” (for so that great Divine\* justly designates what they more delicately call “ the honour paid to images”), they say only, that it is “ dangerous in the case of the uneducated, that is, of “ the great part of Christians.”\* But Bishop Hall treats it, as not merely “ dangerous ” to some, but as sinful in all ; as “ against Scripture ;” “ the Book of God is full of his indignation against this practice ;”—and “ against reason.” “ What a madness is it,” says he, “ for a living man to stoop unto a dead stock ! ”

Next, of “ the invocation of Saints,” these writers say, that it “ is a dangerous practice, as tending to give, “ often actually giving, to creatures the honour and reliance due to the Creator alone.”—p. 12.

But how does the good Bishop, whom they profess to follow, speak on this same point ? “ *These foul superstitions*”, says he, “ are not more *heinous*, than new—and such as whereon we have justly *abhorred* to take part with the practisers of them.” Again, “ This doctrine and practice of the Romish Invocation of Saints, both as new and erroneous, against Scripture and reason, we have justly rejected ; and are thereupon ejected, as unjustly.†”

Again, I lament to read their advice to those who are contending for the Truth against Romanists, that, “ the controversy about Transubstantiation be kept in the background ; because it cannot well be discussed

\* Bishop Hall’s Works, 8vo. vol. ix. p. 340.    † Ibid, pp. 365, 368.

“ in words at all without the sacrifice of godly fear : ” \*  
 —as if that tenet were not the abundant source of enormous practical evils, which the faithful Advocate of the Truth is bound to expose ; in particular, of the extravagant exaltation of the Romish priesthood, which seems to have been its primary object—and, still worse, of that which is its legitimate and necessary consequence, the adoration of the Sacramental Bread and Wine, which our Church denounces as “ Idolatry to be abhorred of “ all faithful Christians.”

I lament, too, the encouragement given by the same writers to the dangerous practice of prayer for the dead. They disclaim, indeed, the intention of giving such encouragement, and I doubt not the sincerity of their disclaimer. But to state that this practice “ is a “ matter of sacred consolation to those who feel themselves justified in entertaining it ” †—(and all, they seem to suggest, may “ *feel themselves* justified,” for it is “ warranted by the early Church ” ) :—to say, further, that it is “ a solemn privilege to the mourner ” —“ a dictate of human nature ”—nay, that it “ may be “ implanted by the God of Nature, may be the voice “ of God within us : ”—to say all this, is surely an “ encouragement ” of the practice so characterized, which is very feebly counterbalanced by their admitting that “ our Church does not encourage it ”—by their abstaining from in “ any way inculcating it ”—or even by their thinking “ it inexpedient to bring forward “ such a topic in public discussion.”

Nor do I assent to their opinion, that “ our Church “ does not discourage ” prayer for the dead ; on the

\* Tracts for the Times, No. 71, p. 9.

† Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, p. 186 et seq.

contrary, if, as they admit, the Church, having at first adopted such prayer, in the general words in which it was used in the ancient Liturgies, afterwards “for the safety of her children relinquished the practice,” even in this sober and harmless form, “in consequence of abuses connected with it in the Romish system”—abuses, of the least of which she says, that they are “grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God;” while of others she declares, that they “were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits;”—I can hardly propose to myself any more decisive mode of discouraging a practice, which, in itself, could not be condemned as absolutely contrary to God’s Word.

I must go further: I must add, and I do so with unfeigned respect for the integrity and sincerity of these writers, as well as for their eminent ability and learning, that I cannot easily reconcile it with Christian discretion, for any member of the Church to speak with so much of favour of a practice which was thus deliberately, and for such grave reasons, repudiated by the Church herself. Still less can I understand what justification can be offered for his saying of the Romanist, that in “deciding that almost all souls undergo a painful purification after death, by which Infectum eluitur scelus, aut exuritur igni, he only “follows *an instinct of human nature.*” Surely, if this be true, the Romanist is right in his decision: for an instinct of our nature could have come only from the Divine Author of that nature—it must be indeed “the voice of God within us.”

In connexion with this subject, I cannot but deplore the rashness which has prompted them to recommend to private Christians the dedication of particular days to the Religious Commemoration of deceased men—

and even to furnish a special Service in honour of Bishop Ken, formed apparently on the model of an office in the Breviary to a Romish Saint. Would it be safe for the Church itself—and is it becoming in private individuals—to pronounce thus confidently on the characters of deceased Christians—in other words, to assume the gift of “discerning of Spirits?” To what must such a practice be expected to lead? The History of the Church of Rome has told us; and the Fathers of our Reformation, in compiling the Liturgy, have marked their sense of the danger, by rejecting every portion of the Breviary which bears on such a practice, even while they adopted all that was really sound and edifying in it. Yet these writers scruple not to recommend this very practice, thus deliberately rejected by those wise and holy men—and (strange to say) recommend it as only “completing what our Reformers have begun,” as “a means of carrying out, in private, the principle and spirit of those inestimable forms of devotion, which are contained in our authorized Prayer Book.”—No. 75, pp. 2, 16.

Again, looking to another part of their dealing with the doctrines of Rome, I lament to see the *reason* for which they enumerate “the necessity of Confession,” in their list of “those *practical grievances*, to which Christians are exposed in the Romish Communion;—namely, “because without it no one can be partaker of the Holy Communion.”\*

They thus seem studiously to decline including in the same list the pretended Sacrament of *Penance* generally (of which confession is but a part); though Penance, as taught by the Church of Rome, is the

\* No. 71, p. 9.

greatest, because the most soul-destroying, of all those "grievances"—we might rather say, the foulest perversion of God's saving Truth, which the cunning of Satan ever put it into the heart of man to conceive. For this unhallowed device, by abusing the gracious promise of Christ given to the Church in his Apostles, by making the *Absolution of the Priest*, not only effectual, but also necessary, for the pardon of all sin committed after Baptism—while it bows the souls and consciences of the People, to a state of slavish fear of the Priest, practically releases them from all other fear, and gives the rein to every corrupt affection of unregenerate nature. Yet, this is not, it seems, one of "the subjects, which," in the opinion of these writers, "may be profitably brought into controversy with Romanists of the present day."—p. 14.

Still more do I lament to read in one of the "Tracts," which, in the main, is worthy of the highest estimation,—I mean "Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism,"—much of what is there said of the effects of Sin after Baptism: for instance, that if, "after having been then washed, once for all, in Christ's blood, we again sin, there is no more such complete ablution in this life:"\*—no restoration "to the same state of undisturbed security, in which God had by Baptism placed us."†

These, and passages like these, however they may be explained, tend to rob the Gospel of the blessed Jesus of much of that assurance of the riches of the goodness and mercy of God in Christ, which is its peculiar message—its glad tidings of great joy:—"Come unto me all that labour, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Our Church teaches us to apply this

\* No. 67, p. 63.

† Ib., p. 58.

blessed promise to those who are "heavy laden" with sins committed after Baptism.

Surely, too, they tend to rob Baptism itself of its full and genuine efficacy,—of that which our Church expresses, when it says, that God "hath vouchsafed to "regenerate us by water and the Holy Ghost, and hath "given unto us *forgiveness of all our Sins*," not of those only which were committed before Baptism, but also of all the Sins we ever shall or may commit, on the conditions (I need not add) of that Covenant, into which we were then admitted, Repentance and Faith.

Nor may we forget the tendency of such language to encourage the pernicious and perilous habit of distinguishing between such sins as may destroy our state of grace, and such as we may think still leave that state secure. Let it never be absent from our minds, that every wilful sin is deadly—and let us beware of hardening our own hearts, and corrupting the hearts of our brethren—by whispering to ourselves or them *which* sin is more or less deadly than others. That which we may deem the least will be deadly enough, if unrepented, to work our perdition:—those which we deem the most deadly will, if repented, have been thoroughly washed away in the blood of our Redeemer.

Lastly, I lament, and more than lament, the tendency at least, if not the direct import, of some of their views "On Reserve in communicating Religious Knowledge," especially, their venturing to recommend to us to keep back, from any who are baptized, the explicit and full declaration of the doctrine of the Atonement.\* I know not how such reserve can be made consistent, not only with the general duty of the Christian Minister, to be

\* No. 80, p. 74.



able, at all times, to say with St. Paul, that he “ has “ not shunned to declare all the counsel of God ;”—but also with the special and distinct requirement of our own Church, that every *child* be taught the Catechism : for I need not remind you that, in the Catechism, this great Article of our Faith holds a most prominent place ; that it is there taught, both by plain implication, in saying that God the Son hath *redeemed* us, again in the inward grace of each Sacrament, and more explicitly, and expressly, in the reason—“ Why the “ Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper was ordained,”—namely, “ for the continual remembrance of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ, and of the benefits which “ we receive thereby.” How is the meaning of these passages to be taught, without also teaching the doctrine of the Atonement ?

I have thus animadverted on several particulars in which I deem the doctrine or language of these writers erroneous. Other instances, it is very likely, might be added. But I cannot close what I have had to say respecting them, without offering my testimony and humble meed of praise to the singular meekness, charity, and forbearance, which they have exercised throughout the controversies, proving themselves to be in Christian temper, whatever be thought of their doctrine, immeasurably superior to most of those with whom they have had to contend. Neither shall I forbear to avow my own opinion, that the Church is, on the whole, deeply indebted to them.

In opposition to the low and sectarian notions, which had too long marked much of the popular theology of the times, they have successfully asserted and vindicated some of the most important doctrines and principles of

the Catholic Church—doctrines and principles which, as ministers of that Church in England, we are under the most express and solemn engagements to maintain. To those engagements look, I beseech you, at all times, with all faithfulness and singleness of heart; disdaining every astute and subtle expedient, by which you may see others attempt to explain away any portion of those tenets, which they and you profess to hold, but which cannot honestly be held, except in “the true, usual, literal meaning” of the terms in which they are expressed.

---

Before I conclude, I would wish to say a few words in recommendation of some of those Societies whose aim and object is the extension of the borders of the Church abroad, and the diffusion and confirmation of Church principles both abroad and at home.

First, the Society for the “Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, especially in our Colonies,” will so soon be brought to your attention by a most able advocate, especially deputed for that purpose, that I spare myself and you all notice of it at present.

And if I invite your attention to another Society, it is not because its merits need any encomium from me, or are not already sufficiently known to you, but because the very nature of its operations, in order that they be made effectual, require a prompt, an unremitting, and combined exertion in Diocesan and District Boards; I refer to the NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR EDUCATION in the Principles of the Church. The statements set forth by the Diocesan Committee at Exeter have attracted the notice of a large portion of the Kingdom by the soundness of the principles on which they are founded, and the judicious expedients by which it is proposed to carry those principles into

action. On the co-operation of you, the Clergy, the success of the endeavour must largely depend. That you will give that co-operation gladly and zealously I cannot doubt: for let me entreat you to remember that *co-operation* is the one thing indispensable,—co-operation with the Central Board.

Of the best mode of conducting the system of teaching I am a very inadequate judge. Only let me express my earnest hope, that not only, though chiefly, the Bible, not only with the Bible, the Liturgy, and Catechism of the Church, but also the Constitution of the Church itself, be made a prominent portion of the matter of instruction. To the more advanced scholars, let the offices of ordaining to the different Orders of Ministers in the Church be plainly set forth: in other words, let them, in the regular course of their reading, be instructed in our “form and manner of consecrating “Bishops, and of ordaining Priests and Deacons.” They will thus learn to understand, and when they understand, to value, that gracious dispensation of God’s Providence, by which He “hath appointed “divers orders of Ministers in the Church, and hath “given some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some “Evangelists, and some Pastors, and Teachers, for the “perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the Ministry, “for the edifying of the Body of Christ.”

There is a third Society, whose claims to your support I am especially requested to recommend—**THE SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING THE EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL CURATES** in populous places. Those claims cannot be more effectually set forth, than by the simple announcement of the object which is sought. But I am bound to add, that the Funds of the Society are very disproportionate to the wants which it wishes to supply. With an income of 6700*l.* per annum, it is

pledged to grants amounting to 6600*l.*, while upwards of fifty new applications remain unanswered—many of them under circumstances of peculiar urgency—some in which a new Church is actually built, and its consecration and use only delayed till Funds are found to maintain a Curate. In mentioning this want to you, I am well aware that I am stating it to those, on whose moderate income the necessary demands of their own Cures are commonly such as leave little means of gratifying their generous feelings in contributing to the wants of other districts. But I mention it, because the existence, and objects, and, I am sorry now to add, the necessities, of this Society cannot be too generally known, nor too often stated. It may be, that this mention of it may interest some of the more wealthy Laity in behalf of a Society, which thus seeks to extend the blessing of Pastoral care to those poor and populous districts, in which Christ's sheep are "scattered abroad without a Shepherd"—"those sheep which he bought with His death, and for whom He shed his blood."

There yet remains one Institution, which I have pleasure in announcing to you, not as needing your aid, but as offering to you and to the Church at large, a great—it may with God's blessing prove a *very* great, and increasing benefit. It is purposed to establish a public school, on a large and very liberal scale, for the Education of the Sons of the Clergy—a school, in which all the branches of knowledge which ought to form the subject of instruction to Christian gentlemen shall be taught by masters of the highest qualifications. And it is calculated, from accurate inspection of the expenses of other large establishments, that this can be effected, with board and lodging, for a charge of 30*l.* per annum to each scholar. The sons of the Laity will be admitted, but at a higher rate of payment, and the profit thereon accruing will be

applied to the education of the orphans of Clergymen. From such an Institution, carrying out the Education of several hundreds together on Church principles, it is not too much to hope, with the blessing of God, that not only will there be a great benefit to the Clergy, but also that an improved system of Education may be established, which shall extend its influence to other seminaries, and spread a wholesome leaven through the land.

And now, my Brethren, I release you from the task of listening to an Address, which I am well aware may have trespassed too much on your patience. Only let us pray the great Head of the Church to bless this, and all the occasions of our assembling together, to our common good, to the improvement of our ministry, to the edification of our people, and to the glory of His Holy Name!

---

## APPENDIX I.

---

### *Correspondence with Lord John Russell.*

#### No. 1.

MY LORD,

*Exeter, 4th October, 1839.*

SOME weeks ago I received, under a cover, superscribed "On Her Majesty's Service," and sealed with a seal purporting to be that of the Committee of Education, a pamphlet entitled "Recent Measures for Promotion of Education in England." I have recently understood that several of my clergy have received copies of the same pamphlet, under similar covers, sealed with the same seal. I therefore take the liberty of asking your Lordship whether this pamphlet has been transmitted to myself and my clergy by the authority of the "Committee of Privy Council appointed to superintend the application of sums granted by Parliament for the purpose of promoting Public Education?"

I have, &c.

H. EXETER.

*The Lord John Russell,*  
&c.      &c.

---

#### No. 2.

MY LORD,

*Buckhurst, October 7, 1839.*

I HAVE had the honour to receive your Lordship's letter of the 4th instant, informing me that your Lordship and several of your clergy have received a pamphlet entitled "Recent Measures for the Promotion of Education in England," under a cover superscribed "On Her Majesty's Service," and sealed with a seal purporting to be that of the Committee of Education.

Your Lordship inquires whether the pamphlet in question has been transmitted to your Lordship and to your clergy by authority of the Committee of Privy Council appointed to superintend the application of sums granted by Parliament for Public Education.

This question would be more properly addressed to the President of the Council. In his absence I can only say that I believe the Committee gave a general direction for the circulation of the pamphlet, but that I was not aware, till I received your Lordship's letter, that this had been done in the formal and official manner stated by your Lordship.

I have, &c.

J. RUSSELL.

---

No. 3.

MY LORD,

*Exeter, Oct. 10, 1839.*

ON my return to Exeter, I had the honour of receiving your Lordship's letter of the 7th inst., and I thank you for the early answer which you have given to the question I felt it my duty to propose.

I assent to your Lordship's suggestion, that this question would be more properly addressed to the President of the Council. But the notoriety of his absence from England made it necessary that I should address your Lordship, whose name stands in the list of the Committee on Education next to that of the Lord President.

Your Lordship having now informed me, that you believe the Committee gave a general direction for the circulation of the pamphlet, entitled "Recent Measures for the Promotion of Education in England," and the cover of a copy of it, now before me, bearing on its margin a printed notice of its having been sent from the "Committee of Council on Education," as well as being superscribed "On Her Majesty's Service," and sealed with the impress of "Privy Council," I cannot but regard the Committee as adopting, and therefore responsible for, the contents of the pamphlet. In consequence, I request your Lordship's attention to a most extraordinary misrepre-

sentation made in it, of words spoken by me in the House of Lords, on the 5th of July last.

The passage to which I refer, is in pages 55, 56, and I quote it at length, to prevent all misapprehension :—

“ One principle which has been more fully illustrated in the debates is especially applicable to these cases, viz.—that while the Government is most anxious that religious instruction should be united to secular, and will grant all proper facilities for that purpose, the State is peculiarly charged with the duty of rendering secular instruction accessible to all, and with the improvement of the quality of such secular instruction, by assistance from the public funds, and by constant superintendence.” In the House of Lords, the Marquis of Lansdowne observed,—“ I said, the State should provide for the education, I did not say for the spiritual and religious education, but for the secular education of the people.” “ The Bishop of Exeter was glad the Noble Marquis had given that explanation. He assented to the principle.” Presently afterwards it is said, “ Upon the principle thus elucidated by the discussions in Parliament, we trust that all parties are now agreed.”

Now the plain and obvious import of this is, that in the discussion of the question in the House of Lords, I assented to the principle, that the duty of the State, in respect to the education of the People, is limited to “ rendering secular instruction accessible to all,” and to “ the improvement of the quality of such secular instruction, by assistance from the public funds, and by constant superintendence.”

But so far is this from being a correct statement, that it is contrary to the whole tenor of the speech delivered by me on that occasion. So manifest, indeed, is the perversion of my very plain meaning, that if it had occurred in an anonymous publication, I must have considered it as wilfully fraudulent. Bearing, however, as it does, the formal and official sanction of the “ Committee on Education,” I cannot ascribe it to any dishonourable motive, and willingly impute it to some most strange and utterly unaccountable misconception. That this is the gentlest description applicable to it, I proceed to satisfy your Lordship, by citing a passage from the report of my speech, which I have the honour of enclosing, and which was corrected by myself immediately after it had been delivered.



At pages 5, 6, I was dealing with a question proposed to the Bench of Bishops by the Lord President: "Do they think that the Church has a right to the Education of the people at large, including that portion of the people, millions in number, who do not belong to the Church?"—My answer was as follows:—

"The Church has no right to claim the enforcement of any system of Education on the people, or any part of the people, least of all on that part which does not belong to the Church. But, my Lords, the Church has a right to demand of the State—and if the State, as well as the Church, is prepared to do its duty, that demand will be answered—the Church, I say, has a right to demand of the State the means of *offering* Education to all, whether they are members of the Church or not. God forbid that the Church should have either the power or the will to compel any persons, or class of persons, to accept its system of education! But we have a right, my Lords, to demand that the State, acknowledging the Church to be the true Church, acknowledging it to profess and to teach the true religion, and thereby implying the duty of the Church to inculcate—ay, and not only to inculcate, but to spread—that blessed truth which it professes;—we have a right to demand that the State shall supply the necessary means to enable the Church to discharge its high functions. I ask, then, the noble Marquis to call on that Government in which he bears so high a place to propose to Parliament such a grant as will enable the Church to educate all within its pale who need public aid; and to offer to educate all without its pale, who will accept its offer, in that holy religion which the noble Marquis and his colleagues, and which the State itself, acknowledge to be true; and, if true, of course to be alone true. Will the noble Marquis do this his duty?"

I am not aware that I could have used words more directly contrary to the sentiment ascribed to me in the Committee's pamphlet, even if I had anticipated, and laboured to prevent, the possibility of such a misstatement.

At pp. 10 and 11 of the enclosed, your Lordship will find the interlocutory remarks between the Lord President and myself, which are more immediately referred to in the pam-

phlet; and, on reading them, you will observe that they relate, not to the point stated in the pamphlet, but to one of a very different kind: viz., whether the State may assist in teaching religious doctrines which it believes to be false.

Your Lordship will also perceive that I did not assent to the Lord President's principle; but the Lord President assented to mine, and joined me in disclaiming the pernicious principle that the State may lawfully assist in teaching such doctrines. It is true that he qualified this disclaimer by limiting its operation to England; but this very limitation marks the more strongly the principle of which we were speaking, and which, as your Lordship perceives, is very different from that which is put into our mouths by the Committee's pamphlet.

I regret the absence of the Lord President; for he, I am confident, if he were in England, would confirm the accuracy of my statement: but I venture to refer your Lordship to any noble Lord who attended to the debate.

Should your Lordship do me the honour of reading the whole of the reported Speech which I now enclose, you will not find a single sentence which affords any shadow of justification of the passage of which I complain—but very much which, if I mistake not, your Lordship will think directly contrary to it.

I have, &c.

H. EXETER.

---

No. 4.

MY LORD,

*Buckhurst, October 15, 1839.*

I HAVE had the honour of receiving your Lordship's letter of the 10th instant. It certainly appears to me that the author of the pamphlet has mistaken your Lordship's meaning. He was probably misled by some incorrect report in the newspapers of what took place in the House of Lords.

I will take care to suspend for the present the distribution of the pamphlet by the Committee of Privy Council.

I am much obliged to your Lordship for the authentic copy of your Lordship's speech delivered in the House of Lords on the 5th of July in the present year—a speech marked by the ability which distinguishes all that proceeds from your Lord-

ship. Yet I cannot but observe that there are some misconceptions of the design of the members of the Committee quite as extraordinary as that which your Lordship has pointed out in the pamphlet. But I will not occupy your Lordship's time with remarks upon this subject, engaged as you now are in the labours of your diocese. I will therefore content myself with saying that it has been the main object of the Committee to extend and encourage the religious instruction of the people ; but that while they have endeavoured to assist in the instruction of the children of churchmen in the doctrines of the Church of England, they have not conceived themselves justified in withholding all public aid for the instruction of those children of the poor, whose parents conscientiously object to allow their children to be taught the Church Catechism, or to be compelled, as the price of their instruction, to attend Divine Service in other than their own places of worship.

I have, &c.

J. RUSSELL.

---

No. 5.

MY LORD,

*Exeter, October 16, 1830.*

I REQUEST your Lordship to accept my thanks for the letter of the 15th, which I have this day had the honour of receiving. The conclusion of that letter gives me peculiar gratification, as it shows that no practical difficulties need any longer to exist in combining due regard for the duties of the State to the Church, with full security to the rights of conscience in those who dissent from her doctrines, and do not join in her worship. For myself, I have no hesitation in avowing that, in my judgment, it would be wrong to "withhold all public aid for the instruction of those children of the poor whose parents conscientiously object to allow their children to be taught the Church Catechism, or to be compelled, as the price of their instruction, to attend Divine Service in other than their own places of worship." I should rejoice to see instituted a conference between the Committee of the Privy Council on Education and the Bishops, for the purpose of carrying into effect your Lordship's very just and moderate principle ; and at the same time to give to the Church that public recognition of her

being the fit guardian and administratrix of natural education, with which your Lordship's principle can so well be reconciled.

The Charge which I have delivered to my clergy, and which has been announced for publication, has noticed the pamphlet sent forth by the Committee, entitled "Recent Measures for the Promotion of Public Education in England;" and has dealt with its contents as authorised by the Committee. Not only the passages actually read by me to my clergy, but also a longer one prepared by me, in which I comment on that pamphlet, will make part of the Charge when published. In truth, your Lordship will perceive that the mere suspension of the circulation of a document, which has already been dispersed so widely and so authoritatively, will not remove the necessity of such comments as I otherwise have thought it my duty to make.

It will give me, however, great pleasure to publish the correspondence which I have had the honour to hold with your Lordship, in my Appendix. It will, I am confident, be read (especially that part of your Lordship's letter of the 15th, to which I have already referred) with the highest satisfaction by others, whose suffrages are more valuable than mine.

I have, &c.

H. EXETER.

---

No. 6.

MY LORD,

*Buckhurst, October 18, 1839.*

I CONFESS I am not sanguine as to the result of any conference between the Bishops and the Committee of the Privy-Council on Education. I do not, however, wish now to discuss the principle laid down by your Lordship, that the Church is "the fit guardian and administratrix of national education." I can only say that I have no objection to the publication of the correspondence between your Lordship and myself. I should, in any case, have thought it right to communicate it to the Lord President, the Lord Privy Seal, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Labouchere, Lord Montague, and Sir George Grey, who at present form the Committee of Privy Council for Education.

I have, &c.

J. RUSSELL.

## APPENDIX II.

## CHURCH DISCIPLINE BILL.

BELIEVING, as I do, that this measure, if carried in any form which it has yet assumed, will be destructive of the Church of England, not as an establishment, but in its true character as a sound branch of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, I have felt it my duty to oppose it to the utmost. During two Sessions that opposition has been successful. The measure, however, will again be brought forward in the next Session; and will be carried, unless, with God's blessing, the strong and *united* expression of the judgment of the great body of the Clergy shall avail to prevent it. The majority of the Bishops assented to the principle of the measure at a meeting held before Easter last, and most of them felt themselves concluded by that assent, with regard to the Bill of last year. Several of them, however, were much dissatisfied with it, and, by their votes in the Committee, testified their wish that the Bill had been based on a different principle. It may reasonably, therefore, be hoped that they will not all consider themselves bound to resume their support of the measure, if it be again brought forward, as it is threatened, in substantially the same form.

But, whatever be the decision of the Bishops, there is little reason to hope that the lay Lords, who may regard the measure as they would any ordinary measure of Law Reform, will oppose the Bill, unless they find that the general sense of the Clergy differs from that of the great majority of the Bishops as already declared. The adoption or rejection of the Bill must, therefore, it is most probable, rest with the Clergy; and *on them* I venture to call for the decision.

For taking this course, I doubt not that I shall be called an agitator. Be it so: I have lived long enough not to be much moved by hard words; and I would rather be proclaimed an agitator, in every newspaper and every society in England, than be told by the still small voice within me that I am a traitor to the Church of Christ. Such a traitor I should be, if, thinking of this measure as I do, I were to falter in my course of strenuous resistance to it. In saying this, I presume not to judge others; and I grieve for the necessity which is on me, to make this disclaimer. Those who do not see in this measure the evils which I think I clearly see in it, are not traitors in supporting it; and, if there be any of these, (which I do not believe) who think the measure *necessary* for the real good of the Church, they would be traitors to that Church if they did not support it.

I now lay before my own Clergy, and before any other Clergy, who shall do this Charge so much honour as to read it, the following documents:—

1. A Protest which I entered on the books of the House of Lords, when that House decided in favour of the principle of the late Bill, by sending it to a Committee.

2. A Correspondence between the Bishop of London and myself, which, in my opinion, affords an additional reason for the Clergy's exercising their judgment on the matter.

Respecting the Protest, as it is applicable to the "Amended" Bill, there are one or two points, on which it may be right that I should say a few words.

The fourth reason of the Protest (that the Bill, in its original state, subjected the Archbishop and Province of York to the jurisdiction of a judge appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury) does not apply to the "Amended" Bill, in which the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of York is made independent of the See of Canterbury.

I rejoice at this amendment, which, so far as it goes, maintains the Constitution of the Church; but, I am sorry to say, this was not the reason for which it was made: the real reason was, that the Archbishop of York, in announcing to the Committee a Petition against the Bill from the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of York, declared his intention of opposing the Bill, if the jurisdiction of *his* Court were destroyed. An assurance

was immediately given, that this part of the Bill should be modified to meet his Grace's wishes. Accordingly, the jurisdiction of the Chancery Court at York was not only preserved, but very greatly enlarged : for to it was given original and sole jurisdiction in every Diocese of the Province, except that of Man.

On so important a concession being made to him, the Archbishop of York became a supporter of the Bill ; and no more was seen or heard of the Petition, which he had announced—whether because the Petitioners had prayed only for their own relief from the operation of the Bill, without testifying any concern for any general principle, has never been stated.

Be this as it may, it is manifest that the alteration, thus introduced, affected the general character of the Bill most materially. Hitherto, the ostensible reason for urging its adoption had been the necessity of remedying the great evil which was alleged to exist at present,—“ of Causes of Correction of Clerks being tried before a Tribunal without adequate experience, and without an adequate Bar.” But this reason cannot any longer be gravely insisted on ; for it is notorious, that in neither of these particulars (nor, so far as I have heard, in any other) does the Court at York excel the Court at Exeter, or at Chester, or at several which might be named. Indeed, by a Return made to the House of Lords, it appears that in the last ten years, while there had been heard, and adjudged, without appeal, *four* Causes in the Consistorial Court of Chester, *not one* Cause had been brought by appeal or letters of request to the Court at York from any Diocese in the whole Province ; and only one original Suit had been there instituted ; which solitary Suit had not been heard nor prosecuted : yet, if this Bill had become a Law, the jurisdiction of the Court of Chester, and of every other within the Province, would have been swallowed up by that of York, on the pretence of its being necessary to give to the whole Province the benefit of the superior experience, and superior Bar, of that Court !

In the future discussion of the matter, this pretence must, I apprehend, be abandoned, and some other must be made to take its place. But no other (so far as I recollect) has been ever suggested, except that which dropped from the Lord Chancellor in the debate on the third reading, namely,

that, incorrigibly bad as he deemed the Bill to be, "as amended by the Select Committee," yet he should vote for it, because it was necessary that some Bill for the Correction of the Clergy should pass (and he despaired of any other), in order that larger measures of Reform in the Ecclesiastical Courts should not be impeded by the obstacles which are at present placed in their way, by the existence of a Bishop's Court, for the enforcement of discipline over the Clergy.

Now, if the Clergy of England deem so highly of the principle of centralization, which is the great favourite with many of the Metropolitan lawgivers of the day, as to be willing to sacrifice to it that episcopal jurisdiction, which (whatever be thought of its sacredness) must be admitted by all to have existed in the Church from the time of the Apostles,—they will not give themselves or the Legislature any further trouble in the matter. But if they think, as I avow myself to think, that the Constitution of our National Church, as a sound branch of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, is involved in the issue, they will exert all their energies, and adopt every fit and becoming expedient, for the purpose of defeating the Bill of last year, if it be revived in the next Session.

In making this appeal to the Clergy at large, I frankly avow my wish, that those Bishops who support the Bill would adopt the same course. One of them has done so, and I honour him for doing it. To the arguments which he has adduced, I shall now venture to address a few observations.

He says of the Bill, that "it leaves untouched any personal authority which the Bishop derives from a Divine source, as far as the same can be exercised, or is even possessed, at present; that we can still in private, and in the spirit of friendliness, give advice and warning, or administer reproof and remonstrance:—or, if such advice and reproof be unheeded, we can have recourse to threats of publicity and exposure, and of ulterior measures, of which the rueful consequence may be set plainly and intelligibly before the offending party."\* It is added, that "*this power is indispensable to, and inseparable from, the Episcopal Office; and this remains entire.*"

In other words, by the Bill as it stands, a Bishop will not be

\* Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Hereford, in July and August, 1839, p. 16.



deprived of the power of doing any of those things, which every other subject of Her Majesty—certainly every other member of Christ's Church—may do likewise. If there be a single particular of those enumerated, (and I cite them as they are enumerated)—if there be, I say, any one particular of the power here stated to be “indispensable to, and inseparable from, the Episcopal Office,” which the parish-beadle has not a right to perform, as well as the Bishop,—I am at a loss to perceive what that particular is.

But the respected writer proceeds, he “cannot deem public judicial power essential to his office.” On the *publicity* of the exercise of the power I say nothing, because it is not the point in discussion; but on the judicial power itself, that it is “inherent in the office of a Bishop,” I appeal to an authority, which both he and every one of the Clergy have repeatedly acknowledged, and will not now deny, to be agreeable to God's Word, the book of consecrating Bishops, and of ordering Priests and Deacons. In examining the Bishop, previous to his consecration, the Archbishop solemnly asks him—“Will you, such as be unquiet, disobedient, and criminous, within your Diocese, *correct and punish, according to such authority as you have by God's Word*, and as to you shall be committed by the Ordinance of this Realm?”—Answer: “I will so do, by the help of God.”

Now, whatever may be said of that which is “committed to us by the Ordinance of this Realm,” it will hardly be denied, that the “Authority which we have by God's Word” is “essential to our office,” and as little will it be denied, that the authority to “correct and to punish the unquiet, disobedient, and criminous, within our Dioceses,” is “*judicial*.” If it be not, it must be arbitrary: an alternative, which I am sure my Right Rev. Brother will not adopt.

He goes further:—“Even assuming,” says he, “the judicial power to be, as claimed, inherent in the Episcopal Office, that power may, *by consent*, be delegated to another,” (in this I fully agree with him,) “and therefore, by analogy of custom, to the Dean of the Arches.” Though I do not pretend to understand what is here meant by “analogy of custom,” I yet *entirely* agree with him, that there is nothing, so far as I know,

in either the person or the office of the "Dean of the Arches," which makes that very learned person incapable of receiving the delegation of judicial powers from any Bishop who may choose to give it to him. But what is all this to our present question? which is, not whether a Bishop may, "by consent, delegate to another" that "judicial power which is inherent in the Episcopal Office," but whether an Act of Parliament may, *without* "his consent," take his *inherent* power from the Bishop, and give it to whomsoever Queen, Lords, and Commons shall think fit.

Let us pass to something, which shall better justify our attention. "Wherever the power actually resides, *it must be exercised through the forms of an Ecclesiastical Court.*" I rejoice to read this sentence, and entirely assent to it—I rejoice the more to read it, because it gives me the authority of one of the most firm supporters of the Bill, against the ludicrous absurdity of that clause in it, "as amended by the Select Committee," which professes to be a "saving of the Archbishops' and Bishops' powers," by enacting that "nothing therein contained shall be construed to affect any authority over the Clergy, which they may now, according to law, exercise, personally, and *without Process in Court*"—in other words, they may exercise their inherent judicial powers in any manner, except that, in which only, my Right Reverend Brother truly says, it can be exercised.

But here, I grieve to say, our accordance is at an end—or rather, I trust, suspended: for I shall be much disappointed, if we do not come together again, before we have done.

"Wherever the power actually resides, it must be exercised through the forms of an Ecclesiastical Court, which, 'having *its origin and authority wholly from the State*, can 'be at any time suspended or amended by the State.'—P. 17.

Now, this is coming to the real pith of the question, and I have pleasure in grappling with it.

That the "Ecclesiastical Court," in which the judicial power of the Bishop "must be exercised," has "*its origin wholly from the State*," I most respectfully, but most confidently deny. For, if this power be inherent in the office, and the Court *is necessary* to it, neither the power nor the Court can

have had its origin from the State, *unless the office itself has its origin from the same quarter*—a position, which I am quite sure the writer whose words I am citing would on no account admit.

In truth, it is a position, not only at variance with sound theology, but most notoriously contradicted by history. For centuries, before the Christian Church was known to the laws of any State, except as a subject of persecution, Bishops held their courts, exercised their inherent judicial power “personally by process in Court.” But, henceforth, if this Bill pass into a law, Bishops will be prohibited from doing this in England—a restraint never before imposed in any Christian country acknowledging Episcopacy.

So much for the origin of these courts. But is “their *authority*,” as this writer affirms, “*wholly* from the State?” I think that, on reconsideration, he will himself be eager to declare that it is not. I have already presumed to remind him, that he has himself solemnly engaged that he will, “by the help of God,” exercise the judicial power inherent in his office, “according to such *authority* as he has *by God’s Word*,”—and, as he has himself said, that this “must be exercised through the forms of an Ecclesiastical Court,” he cannot fail to perceive that this court itself derives part of its authority, (need I say the chief, the distinctive, the sacred part?) not from the State, but from “God’s Word.”

Do I then contend for the independence of the Bishops’ Courts? Is not the Queen in all causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil, within these her dominions, supreme? Most certainly. But Her Majesty’s supremacy in causes ecclesiastical does not arise from the same source as her supremacy in temporal causes—namely, from the judicial power exercised in them being derived from the Crown; but from the inherent right of Sovereignty to govern all persons within the realm, and to see that all perform the duties belonging to them.

What! then, it may be asked; do these Courts in England derive no part of their authority from the Crown? Far otherwise; they derive thence a very important part, but not the most important, because not that which is absolutely *essential*. The *external co-active* power of Ecclesiastical

Courts is wholly derived from the State. The power of inflicting any punishment, immediately affecting the temporal possessions of any members of the Church—and, therefore, of those with whose case we are now concerned, ministers of the Church—we freely, dutifully, and gratefully acknowledge to hold from Her Most Gracious Majesty. The higher power of these Courts—that which reaches to the *internal* status of those whose causes are decided in them—we derive from a higher source, from “Him by whom kings reign.”

And here, while we thus dutifully and gratefully acknowledge the powers given to us by the State, I must not be afraid of saying, that the State would desert its duty, if it did not give such powers in aid of the due exercise of our Episcopal, and, therein, of our judicial functions, as, on full consideration, it shall deem necessary for that purpose. This follows, as of course, from the State’s acknowledging the Church to be a branch of the Holy Apostolic Church. The government by Bishops, and the judicial power of Bishops, as necessary to the high purposes of their institution, are included in that acknowledgment. If, therefore, the present powers of Bishops, and the present constitution of the Bishops’ Courts, be inadequate to the due exercise of spiritual discipline, especially in the correction of criminous Clerks, the legislature has not only the right, but the duty, of reforming those Courts. But it has not the duty, nor the right, nor, with all reverence be it spoken, the *power*, to transfer the inherent authority of Bishops to other persons, even though this be attempted for the laudable and pious purpose announced in the title of this Bill; viz. “for the more effectually enforcing Church discipline.”

The 26th Article says, that “*it appertaineth to the Discipline of the Church*, that inquiry be made of evil ministers, and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their offences, and finally, being found guilty, *by just judgment be deposed.*” By whom is this “*just judgment of deposition from the Ministry*” to be pronounced? Can it be by any one who is not authorized by the Church, to whose “Discipline it appertaineth?”

Again, the 33rd Article says, “the person, which, *by just judgment of the Church*, is rightly cut off from the unity of

*the Church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken by the whole multitude of the faithful as an Heathen and Publican, until he be openly reconciled by Penance, and received into the Church by a Judge, that hath authority thereunto."*

How can a Layman, receiving his authority merely from the State, be esteemed "*the Church?*" How can he deliver any "*just judgment,*" being without jurisdiction delegated to him by the Church? How can he "*cut off from the unity of the Church?*" How can he thus *bind?* or, again, how can he "*receive into the Church?*" What "*authority thereunto hath?*" he? How can he thus *loose?*

That the person, to whom it is proposed to transfer this authority, is one, who already holds a certain spiritual jurisdiction by commission from the Archbishop of Canterbury, makes no difference whatever in the question. It would make no difference, even if the jurisdiction, which the Bill professes to confer on the Judge of the Court of Arches, were *similar* to that which the Archbishop's Commission has given to him. But the jurisdiction contemplated in the Bill is totally different from that which is delegated by the Archbishop—it is a jurisdiction, which the Archbishop could not give—for he has it not himself—he having no original jurisdiction out of his own Diocese. More than this: if given, as the Bill affects to give, it would not *merge* within it the jurisdiction which he already holds by delegation from the Archbishop—viz. jurisdiction in causes of *appeal*; but it would *destroy* it, for no causes of appeal to the Archbishop would remain—the Archbishop's own jurisdiction, both appellate and original, would be extinguished, and the subject delegated to his official would of course altogether vanish. In short, the Judge of the Court of Arches would be no longer an official of the Archbishop, though he might be appointed by him. His power and jurisdiction would be derived solely from Parliament, and might be transferred at pleasure by Parliament. If it be given this year to the Judge of the Court of Arches, it may be given next year to the Judge of the Court of Bankrupts, or to Her Majesty's Justices in Quarter Sessions. What is Erastianism, if this is not?

It has been said by very high authority, that the exercise of *Ecclesiastical* jurisdiction, in a State which establishes and

endows the Church, must be greatly different from the exercise of that jurisdiction, in such a state of things as existed in the Primitive Church. I admit this as an abstract position. But if it be maintained, that the difference in the exercise of that jurisdiction is to be carried so far, as virtually to extinguish the jurisdiction itself, I must withhold all assent to any such doctrine. If the consequence of the Church being endowed by the State, is to rob the Church of its essential powers, what is this, but to realize, in respect to the Church, the fable of antiquity—to famish it to death, by turning what ought to be its support and sustenance into mere gold?

Should matters ever be brought to such a pass in England, I trust the Church would say to the State, not “Thy Gold perish with thee,” but “Take back thy Gold, and let me subsist as I may, and discharge my sacred duties without it or thee.” Thank God, there is no fear of such an issue—an issue pregnant with serious evil to the Church, but with incalculably more serious evil to the State. Thank God, I repeat, there is no fear of such an issue. His holy word is revered in this land; and, so long as it is revered here, the Church will find, that “Kings shall be her nursing Fathers, and Queens her nursing Mothers.”

In conclusion, fully admitting the need of some amendment of the Law, as respects the correction of delinquent Clergymen, I venture to lay before the Clergy the Heads of a Bill for that purpose, requesting their judgment and assistance in preparing it to be laid before Parliament, early in the next Session.

---

(Copy.)

No. 1.

BREVIAE of a proposed Bill for the more effectually enforcing Church Discipline, in the correction of Clerks.

The proposed Bill will have a two-fold object, first, to render more effectual the jurisdiction of the Bishop, in the correction of Clerks, without public proceedings or formal pleadings, by way of admonition, censure, and suspension;—the other, to simplify and render more effectual, and less costly, the formal proceedings for the correction of Clerks, in the *Bishop's Court*.

[Although the object is twofold, and many of the clauses have respect to only one of the two branches, others, especially those which relate to summoning, &c., witnesses, will apply to both.]

First, as to the minor offences, to be dealt with by the Bishop without public proceedings.

The first section enacts, that in case of any offence, punishable only by admonition, censure, or suspension *ab officio et beneficio*, or from either,—or where the punishment sought extends no farther,—any person may lodge in the Bishop's Registry a statement in writing, signed by such person, containing the circumstances of the charge, with particulars of time and place: such statement may embrace no more than [ ] distinct accusations, and must not go back beyond [ ] months, from the date of its being lodged, and must conclude with a prayer, that the Bishop will proceed therein *in foro domestico* under the Act.—The Registrar shall forthwith lay this statement before the Bishop, who shall, according to his discretion, comply with the prayer, or not.

2. If the Bishop, on view of the charge, shall think fit to proceed according to the prayer, he shall indorse on the charge "Proceed hereon." In such case, the Registrar shall cause a copy of the charge to be left at the last or usual place of residence of the Clerk charged, together with a notice commanding the defendant, within [ ] days, to give in his answer in writing, in which the defendant shall either object that the matter does not amount to any offence, in which case he shall be taken to admit the truth of the charge, or deny the charge to be true by pleading that he is not guilty thereof: Provided that it shall be allowable to split the charge, and plead in all or any of the ways above mentioned to the several parts thereof respectively: Provided also, that it shall not be lawful for the Bishop to proceed thus *in foro domestico*, in any case, in which the Clerk charged shall state in answer to such charge, that he claims that it be tried in the Consistorial Court, as hereinafter provided.

3. The Bishop shall cause a copy of the answer to be served on the party promoting the charge, together with notice of such convenient day, within not less than [ ]

days, nor more than [ ] days, and of such convenient place within the Diocese, as he shall appoint for the hearing of the parties by themselves, their Counsel or Proctors, and the Witnesses.

The Witnesses, unless in cases in which the Bishop shall otherwise order, shall be examined by word of mouth in the presence of the parties and of the Bishop, and the evidence taken in writing and recorded by the Registrar.

4. At the hearing of the case, the Bishop shall take to himself four assistants at the least, to wit, the Archdeacon of the Archdeaconry in which the Defendant is beneficed, or charged with cure of souls; or, if not beneficed or so charged, is resident; the Chancellor, one member of the Chapter, and one Priest, of five years' standing.

But if the assistance of the Archdeacon, Chancellor, or any member of the Chapter, cannot in the judgment of the Bishop be conveniently had, his place may be supplied by a Priest of five years' standing.

And no judgment against the Defendant shall pass, unless the majority of such assistants shall advise the Bishop, that he, the Defendant, is in their judgment guilty of the offence charged. Whereupon, if the Bishop concur in the advice so tendered, he shall pronounce the party guilty, and pass such sentence as to justice shall belong.

The Judgment to be with or without Costs, as the Court shall direct, and those Costs to be taxed, and payment enforced as after provided.

5. If the sentence pronounced be that of suspension, the Defendant may within [ ] days lodge a Notice of Appeal to the Archbishop of the Province, with the Registrar of the Archbishop, and serve a copy on the other party.

Such Notice shall operate as a stay of Execution of the Sentence for one month; and if, at the expiration of that time, the Defendant shall not have entered into a recognizance before the Registrar of the Bishop, in the sum of [ ] pounds, with two sureties in [ ] pounds each, to be approved by the Registrar, having given forty-eight hours' previous notice to the other party conditioned for the due prosecution of the Appeal, and abiding the decision thereof, and for the *payment of such Costs*, both of the original Suit and of the



Appeal, as the Archbishop shall decree, the Appeal to be foreclosed, and the original Sentence carried into effect.

In case of Appeal, on perfecting the recognizance, the Registrar shall submit to the Archbishop's Registrar a true copy of the original statement and answer, and of all the evidence taken on the hearing; the Archbishop shall not be at liberty to hear any further evidence; but, if he shall be of opinion that further evidence is essential to the justice of the case, he may remit the case for rehearing.

6. The Archbishop shall appoint a convenient day and place for hearing the Appeal, and his sentence shall be final.

7. For the better securing the appearance of the parties at the hearing, in case of non-appearance of the party promoting the charge after due proof of notice, the complaint shall be dismissed with Costs.

In case of non-appearance of the Defendant after similar proof, the complaint shall be taken *pro confesso*, and such judgment shall be pronounced, with or without Costs, as, upon the facts stated in the charge, shall to the Bishop seem fit.

8. Similar provision in case of Appeal, and the party appealed against not appearing. If the Appellant does not appear, on that being certified by the Archbishop to the Bishop, the recognizance to be put in force.

9. The sentence of the Bishop or Archbishop, as the case may be, to have the same force, and, except where otherwise provided, to be enforced as any sentence of Court Christian.

---

The following Clauses will embrace public and formal suits for offences of a graver character, and for all offences, for which the Clerk charged shall claim that he be so tried :—

1. The first clause will provide that no Court shall possess original jurisdiction in any suit, except in such cases as are before provided for, against a spiritual person below the rank of a Bishop, or for the purpose of pronouncing any sentence of Excommunication, Suspension *ab officio et beneficio*, Deprivation, or any spiritual censure, except only the several Consistorial Courts of the Bishops, subject to Appeal as after.

provided, with a proviso saving the peculiar jurisdiction of Archbishops and Bishops in the Diocese of another Bishop.

2. The Bishop shall be the Judge of his Consistorial Court, and shall, by himself or his official, hear and determine all such Suits. But neither the Bishop nor his official shall hear and determine the same, unless the official be either a D. C. L., and have practised as an Advocate in one of the Ecclesiastical Courts for not less than five years, or be a Barrister of not less than seven years' standing, without the assistance of some Assessor so qualified.

The Bishop, for his better information on any point of law, arising in any such Suit, may have an Assessor, qualified in like manner.

The Assessor shall not have power to hear and determine, or pronounce sentence, but only to act as legal adviser.

The Bishop may, for his better information on any point of law, send a case for the opinion of the Judge of the Court of Arches.

3. The Bishop may hold his Court for hearing and determining such Suits at such times and in such places, within the Diocese, as he shall appoint.

4. Any person intending to institute any such suit, shall deliver to the Registrar a written statement of the offence, with specification of time and place.

5. The Bishop shall, within fourteen days after the receipt of the Statement, appoint not less than three, or more than five, clergymen, beneficed within the Diocese, of whom one shall be, either the Archdeacon, or a Rural Dean of the Archdeaconry wherein the offence is committed ; or, in case of a suit against a Clerk resident in the Diocese where the suit is instituted for an offence committed out of the Diocese, then of the Archdeaconry wherein the Clerk may reside, to INQUIRE whether there be sufficient and probable grounds for the Suit.

Notice shall be given within fourteen days after such appointment, under the hand of the Archdeacon or Rural Dean, to the party instituting the Suit, to attend with his witnesses and proofs at such time and place as he shall appoint, with power

of adjournment; and the Commissioners shall proceed to examine the witnesses on oath, and inquire and find whether there is probable and sufficient ground for the charge; and the Archdeacon, or Rural Dean, shall return the Inquisition, or finding, certified under his hand and seal, to the Bishop, and the finding of the majority shall be sufficient.

6. For the purpose of compelling the attendance of witnesses on such Inquisition, the Court, in which the suit is instituted, may grant subpoenas, and *subpœnas duces tecum*; and the witness not obeying, having been duly served and tendered his reasonable expenses, shall incur the same penalties as if such writ had issued out of a Court of Law, and the Courts of Law shall have power to punish such disobedience.

7. If the return shall be that there is sufficient and probable cause, then a citation shall issue, and the proceedings shall be according to the Ecclesiastical Laws of this Realm. Provided that the Officer of the Court, serving the citation, shall therewith deliver to the Defendant a copy of the charge, with specification of time and place, according as the same has been delivered to the Registrar as before provided.

8. All such suits shall be commenced within two years after the offence committed; or, if there shall be a conviction for the offence at Common Law, then within six months after such conviction, although more than two years after the offence committed.

9. In all such suits the proceedings shall be according to the Ecclesiastical Law in cases of correction of Clerks: Provided that, upon any articles of charge being allowed by the Court as admissible, the Defendant shall be required to give a separate issue to each article, and all further pleading shall be concluded before the taking of any evidence: Provided that the Court may enlarge the time for giving such separate issues.

10. The Court shall in every case, when it conveniently may be, cause all the witnesses in any such suit to be examined on

oath by word of mouth, and the witnesses may be cross-examined and re-examined by the parties, their counsel or proctors: Provided that the Court may, on motion, order evidence to be taken on interrogatories, or by Commission as hereafter provided.

11. The Court may, if it see fit, in any such suit, issue one or more Special Commissions to some person being a Doctor of Civil Law, or a Barrister of not less than five years' standing, to take evidence by word of mouth, and transmit the same to the Registry, in such form and manner as shall be by the Commission directed, and witnesses may be examined, cross-examined, and re-examined by the parties; [and the Commissioner may make a special report touching such examination, and the conduct or absence of any witness or other person thereon, and the Court may proceed thereon as in cases of contempt.]

12. The Court may, in any such suit, order the examination on interrogatories, before the Registrar or other person to be named by the Court, of any witness within the jurisdiction of the Court, or issue Commission for examination of witnesses on interrogatories out of the jurisdiction, and make orders as to the time and manner of examination, and other matters connected therewith, as well within the jurisdiction as without.

13. Authorises the producing of witnesses out of prison, on a Habeas Corpus.

14. Examinations upon a Commission, whether by word of mouth, or upon interrogatories, shall be upon oath or affirmation, where affirmation is allowed by law; and persons wilfully and corruptly giving false evidence shall be liable to the penalties of perjury.

15. The Costs of examination of witnesses under Commission or otherwise, by virtue of the Act, and of the proceedings thereon, shall be Costs in the discretion of the Court, and, if no order made, shall be Costs in the suit.

16. The Court, in any such suit, may direct a feigned issue

to be tried in any Court of Common Law, in like manner as is now done by the High Court of Chancery, and to direct that, on the trial of such issue, depositions already taken of any witnesses who shall have died, or be incapable, may be received in evidence; and that such documents shall be produced, and such facts admitted as to the Judge shall seem fit; and may also order a new trial, either generally or upon certain points, and that, in case any witness examined at the former trial shall have died, or become incapable, direct that parole evidence of the testimony of such witness shall be received.\*

17. The costs in all such suits shall be paid by such parties, and taxed by the Registrar in such manner, as the Court shall direct; and payment may be enforced in the same manner as costs between party and party may be enforced in any Ecclesiastical Court.

18. Any party to such suit, being dissatisfied with the judgment, may within fourteen days give notice to the Bishop, and the other party, of his intention to appeal, and give security for costs as after provided; and thereupon appeal to the Archbishop of the Province, who shall proceed to hear and determine such appeal.

Whether or not a further appeal shall be allowed will be for consideration.

Against the allowance may be urged, 1st, The great additional expense; 2nd, The analogy of the proceedings in all other criminal causes.

For the allowance, no other reason is apparent except the supremacy of the Crown; and upon this it may be remarked that the appeal to Her Majesty in her Court of Chancery (since transferred to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council) was, not by common law, but only by Statute 25 Hen. VIII., c. 19; and that the first Statute for the restraint of appeals, 24 Hen. VIII., c. 12, § 6, enacted that the appeal shall be to the Archbishop only, who shall definitively decree and adjudge the matter without any other appeal; and while

\* This Clause is adopted from the Bill of last Session.

this was the enactment of a law made with a sole view to appeals, the provision in the statute of the next year was part of the statute for the submission of the Clergy, and seems to have been dictated by the peculiar circumstances of the times, and by the leaning of the Archbishops and Bishops of that day to the Court of Rome.

If it be necessary for the honour of the Crown to preserve this right of appeal, let the party have the option of appealing at once to Her Majesty in Council, but without being permitted to have two appeals. If it be allowed, the next clause will be

19. Either party may, within like time, as aforesaid, and on like security, appeal to Her Majesty in Council, to be referred to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council: Provided that there shall be no such appeal from any interlocutory decree or order, not having the force of a definitive sentence, and thereby ending the suit in the Court below, save by the permission of the Judge of such Court. And in every such case of appeal, all Archbishops or Bishops, who are members of Her Majesty's Privy Council, shall be members of the said Judicial Committee, and at the hearing of every such appeal two or more of the said Archbishops or Bishops shall be present, and shall assist and have voices at the hearing.

20. Every appellant shall be required to give such security as the Court below shall think fit for the Costs of the Appeal, and for all other costs previously incurred, and for his obedience to the sentence of the Court below, in case the Appeal shall be dismissed.

21. The Judges of the Consistorial Courts may make general rules for regulating pleading and practice, such rules being laid before the Judge of the Court of Arches, for his approval, and approved.

22. Service of Notice on an Archbishop shall be by service on the Registrar.

23. The Statute of 27 Geo. III., limiting suits for incontinence to eight months, not to extend to Clerks.

24. Provision for enforcing appearance and obedience to orders of the Court by certificate to a Court of Common Law, and writ thereon, as at present allowed. Proceedings not to be set aside for informality.

25. To avoid all doubt as to the jurisdiction of Bishops, in case of offences committed within their diocese, by Clerks not beneficed, or beneficed only in another diocese ; provision that, if any offence contrary to good morals, or the canons, or discipline of the Church, cognizable in the Consistorial Court, shall be committed by a Clerk not beneficed in the diocese, the suit may be instituted in the Court of the Bishop, within whose diocese the offence is committed.

26. In case of a spiritual person found guilty in the diocese where the offence is committed, being beneficed in another diocese, the Bishop to certify the finding to the Bishop of the diocese wherein he is beneficed, and the Clerk, being cited to appear before such Bishop, shall receive sentence there, whether he appear or not : Provided, that shall not prevent a Bishop instituting a suit in his Consistorial Court, against a person beneficed in his diocese, for an offence committed out of his diocese, except where a suit for the same offence shall have been instituted in the diocese where the offence is committed.

27. When on hearing any such suit a spiritual person shall be suspended, the Bishop shall, during the suspension, sequester the profits of his preferment, and, by order, direct the application, after providing for the duties, to the payment of the costs, and sustaining the burthens of the preferment, and, in case of surplus, towards the augmentation or improvement of the preferment ; and no part of such profit shall be paid to the spiritual person suspended, or applied for his benefit, or in satisfaction of any previous sequestration at the suit of a creditor, except as a judgment obtained before the passing of the Act, unless, upon special cause, the bishop shall think fit otherwise to direct ; such order, with the reasons for making the same, to be filed in the registry.

28. Where a spiritual person, found guilty and sentenced to be suspended, deprived, or deposed, shall appeal, the Bishop may, by his order, prohibit him from officiating pending the appeal, and sequester the preferment; the profits to be accounted for when the appeal shall determine, and, if the judgment be affirmed, applied as in case of definitive sentence: Provided that the Bishop may allow thereout to the spiritual person a competent sum for the maintenance of himself and family pending the appeal, and also such costs of appeal as the Judge to whom the appeal is made shall order.

29. Power to the Bishop who shall have pronounced sentence of suspension, on consideration of the state of the parish, and satisfactory proof of the penitence and amendment of the spiritual person, to abridge the term of suspension, and permit him to resume his functions, and take the profits of his benefice: Provided that such remission be previously transmitted to the Archbishop of the province, who shall signify his assent to, or dissent from, such remission.

30. Act not to extend to Scotland, Ireland, the Isle of Man, or the Channel Islands.

31. Act may be repealed or altered in the present Session.

---

## No. II.

### *Church Discipline Bill. Protest of the Bishop of Exeter against the Bill of the last Session.*

Resolved, That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee upon the Church Discipline Bill.—June 4, 1839.

#### Dissentient—

1. Because, though the ecclesiastical judges derive their power *in foro exteriori*, even in spiritual matters, from the State, their authority is independent of, and pre-existent to, the Sanction of the temporal law, which merely adds temporal consequences to the ecclesiastical censures, the infliction of which is



part of the power of the keys, vested in the Church by its Divine Founder, and exercised by it in the earliest ages. It follows, that the State, though it may refuse to add a civil sanction to the exercise of the spiritual authority, cannot either grant that authority which does not spring from any human source, or take it away from any one, in whom the Divine constitution of the Church has vested it. Consequently, this Bill, prohibiting in every diocese the exercise of all spiritual jurisdiction, so far as any spiritual censure on a criminous clergyman is concerned, except that of the Court of Arches, doth exceed the power of human law, inasmuch as it affects to deprive Bishops of that essential authority and inherent right which appertain to their sacred office by the Word of God; and which they, at their consecration, have promised and vowed that they, by the help of God, will faithfully and duly exercise by correcting and punishing such as be criminous within their respective dioceses.

This fundamental objection to the Bill is not removed by the 26th clause, which professes to "save any authority over the clergy which Bishops may now, according to law, exercise personally and without judicial process;" for judicial process is essential to the due exercise of episcopal authority, which, without it, ceases to be judicial, and must become either arbitrary or utterly ineffective. It is prescribed by the Apostles. It was used and practised in the Church for 300 years before Christianity became the religion of any state, or its laws and discipline were enforced by any human government. Its necessity is recognised and asserted by all the soundest and ablest divines of the Reformed Church of England, who have written on the nature of the visible Church, by Bishops Jewell, Bilson, Hall, Bramhall, Stillingfleet, Jeremy Taylor, Beveridge, by Hooker, Field, Hammond, and many other luminaries of that age in which theological learning in England was most diligently and most successfully cultivated, not to mention other authorities of the last and the present centuries.

2. Because, to prohibit judicial process, even in the domestic-forum of the Bishop, and thereby, as was admitted in debate, to extinguish all episcopal jurisdiction, on the plea that *the Church is now protected by the State*, is to confound things

essentially distinct: it is in effect, however laudably intended, to betray the Church, and to mislead the State. On the one hand, it forbids the exercise of the most sacred rights and duties of those to whom they are committed by the word of God, (being thus an act of direct persecution,) and professes to transfer them to another, whom no human law can empower to exercise them in some of the highest particulars enumerated in the Bill. Such are excommunication, deposition, and degradation, judgments which cannot be pronounced by any but those to whom the Divine Head of the Church hath committed the keys of His kingdom, and the power to bind and to loose.

On the other hand, while the Bill thus seeks to arm a layman, by authority of Parliament, with that spiritual sword which not the highest lay potentate on earth can wield, it hides from the Sovereign, and from the great council of the nation, that solemn duty which "He by whom kings reign, and princes decree justice," hath inseparably annexed to Christian magistracy, the duty of upholding and enforcing the essential discipline of his Church—a duty, which this State, so long as it acknowledges our own apostolic branch of that Church, can only discharge by sustaining and strengthening, in all things necessary, the government by Bishops,—a duty which the sovereigns of this realm have hitherto religiously observed, and which the Legislature hath repeatedly recognized in its most solemn acts, especially in that great statute of 24 Henry VIII. c. 12, which most eloquently, yet most accurately, sets forth the constitution of this imperial realm, "governed by one supreme head, under whom a body politic, compact of all sorts and degrees of people, divided in terms, and by names of spirituality and temporality are bound to bear, next to God, a natural and humble obedience;" "that part of the said body politic called the spirituality, having always been thought, and being also, at this hour, found sufficient and meet of itself, without the intermeddling of any exterior person or persons, to administer all such offices and duties as to their rooms spiritual doth appertain." And again, in those more modern statutes, which are, as it were, the landmarks of the Constitution, the 1st William and Mary, c. 6, passed by Mr. Somers and the other enlightened patriots of that day, and embodying the contract between the

sovereign and the people in the coronation oath; of which contract the "preserving the rights and privileges of the Bishops and Clergy" is a prominent part;—And the Act of Union with Scotland, reciting and confirming, as a fundamental article of that union, the act for securing the Church of England, in which it is especially provided that every King or Queen, coming to the royal government of the Kingdom of Great Britain, shall take and subscribe an oath that he will maintain, to the utmost of his power, not only "the doctrine and worship," but "the discipline and government of the Church of England."

3. Because the Dean of the Arches, holding only a limited commission from his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, which commission does not extend to original jurisdiction in any diocese whatsoever, would not have even the semblance of ecclesiastical authority to exercise the powers proposed to be given to him by this Bill. Neither can this fundamental defect be supplied by any new and enlarged commission from the Archbishop, who hath not himself a right of original jurisdiction, (except in case of nullities,) in any other diocese than his own; such right, being contrary to the laws of the primitive Church, always hitherto held sacred—contrary to a canon of the Council of Nice, acknowledged by the laws both of the Church and State of England to be the first Œcumenical Council—contrary to the canonical law of England, as expounded even by Lynwood, the highest authority for interpreting that law, himself Official Principal of the Archbishop of Canterbury of his day, who expressly says, "the Archbishop cannot depute Officials to hear causes in the diocese of any of his suffragans. For, as the Archbishop himself cannot constitute an Official in the Diocese of another Bishop, neither can he there exercise anything which concerns judicial powers." Indeed, the assumption by the Archbishop of Canterbury, or his officers, of original or concurrent jurisdiction in another diocese, hath been repeatedly adjudged in the highest Courts of England to be an usurpation, founded solely on his ancient claim of being *Legatus Natus* of the Pope. So that the power which the present Bill either recognises as already existing in the Court of Arches, or affects to give to it by its provisions, that Court is not competent to exercise, unless the supremacy claimed by the Pope

do indeed reside within this Church, in the Archbishop of Canterbury.

In accordance with this language of the laws have been the solemn declarations of our most illustrious princes, claiming indeed, as is their due by the laws of God and man, to be over all persons, and in all causes, both spiritual and temporal, supreme; yet disclaiming all authority of ministering God's word, of which the power of the keys, and of binding and loosing is an especial part: in a word, having both the right and the duty to rule all estates and degrees of men committed to their charge by God, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers.

4. Because, by an unprecedented and unprincipled assumption of power, the Bill professes to subject the Clergy of the province of York, both those of the com-provincial Bishops therein, and even those of the Archbishop and metropolitan himself of that province, to the jurisdiction of the court of the Archbishop of Canterbury; whereas the province of York, and the jurisdiction of the Archbishop and Bishops thereof, are as wholly independent of the Archbishop of Canterbury as they are of any prelate in the most remote corner of the Christian world.

5. Because the only advocate of the Bill, who discussed its provisions, admitting in several important particulars that great principles were violated by it, rested its justification solely on the practical benefits sought thereby: thus, in conformity with that fatal policy which has been the bane of our times, proposing to sacrifice, in a matter of this high religious nature, principle to expediency; although the highest authority in the Church, by just before declaring that the actual result even of the present most defective state of ecclesiastical discipline is such, as admits of little improvement through the operation of law in the general tone of clerical manners, had precluded even the plea of any urgent necessity for making the sacrifice.

6. Because, on the soundest considerations even of expediency itself, the provisions of the Bill are open to just objection, inasmuch as they have a direct tendency to destroy, or most grievously to impair, the wholesome authority of Bishops, by making them, instead of judges, to become merely

the prosecutors of their Clergy, before a lay tribunal ; or, it may be, to employ them as executioners of the sentences of that tribunal.

7. Because, although it may be true that Bishops are not likely to be skilled in legal science, they must be more competent, than laymen can be expected to be, to decide those questions of ecclesiastical discipline, which, in the exercise of their spiritual jurisdiction, would most commonly come before them. As ecclesiastics, they must be most competent to decide whether, and in what degree, the ecclesiastical duties of a clergyman have been violated ; more particularly, because many things are criminal in a clergyman, which in a Layman would be merely indecorous, and not always even indecorous ; and many things are punishable by the Canon Law, and the principles of ecclesiastical discipline, to which no principle of temporal law is even applicable. Again, and in a still higher degree, Bishops must be more competent, than lay judges, to decide in cases where the question relates to the soundness of doctrines taught or sanctioned by a clergyman ; especially as the constitution of the Church has provided him with an Ecclesiastical Council to assist him in his decisions ; and, meanwhile, he can experience no difficulty in obtaining the best legal advice, enabling him to dispose of questions of law as satisfactorily as any ordinary Court.

Eighthly and lastly. Because, if this Bill shall pass into a law, that most estimable and venerable body of men, the Clergy of England and Wales, will be reduced to a worse condition than any other class of Her Majesty's subjects, being made liable to answer to charges affecting their highest religious and civil rights, their feelings and characters as men, their functions as Christian Ministers, before a remote judicature, which, because it is remote, can never inspire confidence, but will be found, in practice, at once to prevent the prosecution of real delinquency, and to rob calumniated innocence of that best protection, the known characters of the accused and the accusers, as well as of the witnesses by whom the accusation is sustained or repelled.

H. EXETER.

---

## No. III.

*Correspondence with the Bishop of London.*

(Copy.)

No. 1.

MY DEAR LORD,

*Modbury, 9th August, 1839.*

I YESTERDAY saw in a newspaper that the Church Discipline Bill is to be committed in the House of Commons on Monday night. I need not express to you my astonishment at this, recollecting that, when you prevailed on the scanty remnant of an exhausted House (after midnight of the 25th ult., and after long debates on two other important questions) to give to your Bill a third reading, it was stated by you, that you did not think it right that the Bill should pass during the present Session, but that you hoped it would have a third reading in the House of Lords, and that it might then be considered by the Clergy during the recess, and a new Bill, in preparing which you were so good as to say that you hoped for my assistance, might be brought into Parliament in the next Session. That you said all this sincerely, I have no doubt; and that it was only by your saying this that the House was induced to accede to your urgent request, I am equally certain. It is, therefore, with unbounded surprise, that I perceive that the Bill is now apparently being carried through the House of Commons by Government. Whether your representation of the ground on which you pressed the third reading in our House can arrest the further progress of the Bill, I know not; but I venture to assure myself that you have made, or will forthwith make, the attempt.

I am on my tour of visitation. A letter addressed to me at the Post-office, Plymouth, will reach me, as I shall be for several days near that place. I write in haste to save the post.

I am, my dear Lord,

Yours very faithfully,

*The Lord Bishop of London.*

H. EXETER.

(Copy)

No. 2.

MY DEAR LORD,

*London House, Aug. 12, 1839.*

I PROTEST most strongly against the interpretation which you have put upon my speech on the third reading of the

Church Discipline Bill. Most assuredly I did not commit the absurdity of expressing a wish that a Bill which I had done my best to carry through the House of Lords should not pass the Commons. I did express my belief that, after what the Lord Chancellor had said, the Bill would not in fact pass the House of Commons; and I said also that there were imperfections in the Bill, which the delay would give us an opportunity of remedying. But I entirely dissent from your opinion, that what I said in that respect prevailed upon the House of Lords to pass the Bill, or that its supporters had any advantage in the thinness of the House. On the contrary, I believe that your minority bore a larger proportion to the majority, than it would have borne in a fuller House; and that, if we had declared our determination to do all in our power to carry the Bill through the Commons, it would equally have passed, the Chancellor being the only person who said that he voted for it, not approving it, but believing that it would not pass the other House. You cannot have forgotten that every other Peer who was present when I spoke, with the exception of the three or four whom you told me you reckoned upon as likely to vote with you, were in favour of the Bill. *You* certainly were not induced to forego opposition by any understanding that the Bill was to be dropped: for, by going to the vote, you effectually precluded the supposition of any such understanding; at least, of any compromise or agreement. The course which you took implied the rejection of any such compromise, had it been proposed, which certainly was not the case. Lord Devon agrees with me in my assertion, that there was no understanding to the effect which you suppose. Lord Shaftesbury confirms the accuracy of my statement. The Lord Chancellor, upon being asked whether there was any objection to proceeding in the House of Commons, if the Bill should be taken up there, replied "Certainly not." It is so obvious, that I hardly think it necessary to state it, that my remarks as to the probable fate of the Bill in the Commons referred to its abandonment by the Lord Chancellor, who was the author of the Bill; and not to the objections of its opponents.

Far, therefore, from thinking that I should act with the slightest degree of inconsistency in consenting to its being *carried through* the House of Commons with the necessary

amendments, I am very doubtful whether the withholding of such consent would not justly subject me to that charge.

I have however stated to Dr. Lushington, and through him to Lord John Russell, the impression which you state to exist in your mind, and the probability, that the Archbishop and the Bishop of London will be denounced to the Clergy, if the Bill should be pressed, as having sanctioned a departure from a supposed engagement, to which in fact neither of them was in any way a party.

What course will be pursued by the Government I cannot say. If the Bill should be dropped, the Archbishop wishes it to be clearly understood that a Bill, which will probably be the same as to its leading provisions, will be brought into the House of Lords on the very first day of the next Session, and pressed on with all practicable speed.

Believe me, my dear Lord,

Yours faithfully,

C. J. LONDON.

*The Lord Bishop of Exeter.*

P.S. I wrote this letter yesterday, in London, and unluckily brought it to Fulham in my pocket, and did not discover the mistake till it was too late for the post.

(Copy.)

No. 3.

MY DEAR LORD, *Pentillie Castle, 15th August, 1839.*

IF you really thought that my former letter expressed or implied that there was any "compromise or agreement" between us, to the effect that the Church Discipline Bill was not to be proceeded with, I venture to assure you, that a re-perusal will convince you that you misinterpreted it; and, therefore, that the question which you proposed to Lords Devon and Shaftesbury was altogether out of place. What I intended to be understood as saying was, that you, having admitted the existence of much imperfection in the Bill, and having assented to the force of several objections (not indeed specified by you)



which had been urged against it, did yet entreat the House to give to it a third reading, "in order that, being printed, it might be considered by the Clergy during the recess, and that, after such consideration, another Bill might be introduced in the next Session better adapted to the exigencies of the case; in drawing up of which you were so good as to say you hoped for my assistance." My memory is distinct and confident on this main particular; and I am assured by one who derived his information from the newspapers alone, that such was the impression made on his mind by the printed report. Such, therefore, is, I conceive, the impression left on the minds of the Clergy in general. In truth, the whole tenor of your speech, when I heard it, seemed to me to show that you not only did not expect the Bill to pass the House of Commons, but that you did not wish that it should be even taken up in that House in the very imperfect state in which you admitted it to be;—that you urged the Lords to read it a third time, not with a view of making it a law, but for the purpose which I have already mentioned; and, as this purpose seemed manifestly not to require a third reading of the Bill, I considered your urging the House to accede to the motion only as another mode of asking, that the feelings of those, who had introduced or supported the Bill might be spared the pain of an adverse vote.

Whether, in a full House, the majority would have been for or against the Bill, and in what proportion larger or smaller than the actual division exhibited, are matters of conjecture, on which neither of us, perhaps, ought very confidently to pronounce. I admit, that, when we entered the House on that day, you had strong reason to expect a triumphant issue. The Ministers were understood to have made the support of the Bill a Government question; and the Duke of Wellington and his friends were understood to be desirous and likely to support it, in deference to the authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and (as had been stated) of all the Bishops who were in London before Easter, when the Bill was drawn. But you will recollect that, after the Lord Chancellor had declared his strong sense of the very objectionable character of the Bill (though he said that he should vote for it, because it was necessary to his ulterior views that some Bill should pass, and he

despaired of any other being carried through in the present Session), the leading Ministers left the House, and were followed by almost all their usual supporters, manifestly, as it appeared to me, because they would not give their further support to a Bill pronounced to be so very bad by "the Lord Chancellor, who," you say, "was the author of the Bill," but who never had owned a nearer relation to it than that of adoptive father, and who repudiated even that connexion with it, in the state in which it was then presented. On the other hand; the Duke of Wellington stated that, after hearing what I had said against the Bill, it was, in his opinion, impossible to come to a vote without an adjournment of the debate; and, as you insisted on going on, his Grace, with very many of his friends, left the House. I may add, that one of those who voted with you told me, that he so voted, because the Bill was not to pass.

Such are the grounds, on which I believe that a vast majority of the Lords who attended on that day were satisfied that the Bill ought not to become a law. Whether, if they had remained, they would nevertheless have voted for it, is a question which I have too much respect for them to moot; especially, when I consider the very grave nature of the measure itself.

After all, can you be surprised at the conclusion to which I arrived, in respect both to their judgment of the Bill, and to yours, when, even now, you write of your "*consenting* to the Bill's being carried through the House of Commons with the *necessary amendments*?" Can words more plainly imply that the Bill is, in its present state, and was, therefore, when you urged its third reading in the House of Lords, utterly unfit to become the law of the land?—an admission, on your part, which concedes all that I could expect or desire; and is the more satisfactory, because it has been confessedly extorted by the *necessity* of the case.

I read, with some surprise, that you "have stated to Dr. Lushington, and through him to Lord John Russell," not only "the impression which I state to exist in my mind," but also, and seemingly in consequence of that impression, "the probability that the Archbishop of Canterbury and yourself will be *denounced* to the Clergy, if the Bill should be pressed, as having sanctioned a departure from a supposed engagement, to which,

in fact, neither of them was in any way a party." On this you must permit me to say, that, if such an argument shall suffice, or is intended, to stop the further progress of the Bill, I am not inclined to criticise very rigidly either the accuracy of your statement, or the propriety of the terms in which you express your apprehension of its consequences. I content myself with assuring you, that, if, after your own promise, voluntarily given, for the sake of facilitating the third reading of the Bill—a promise heard by the Archbishop, and heard by him without remark—that the Clergy shall have full opportunity to consider the Bill before the next Session—that their judgment shall be allowed its due weight—and that a new Bill shall be prepared by you, inviting the assistance of those most opposed, on principle, to the present;—if, I say, after all this, the course be ultimately pursued, which the concluding sentence of your letter declares, as by authority, to be intended—and be pursued with your concurrence—that is, if “a Bill, the same as the present in all its leading provisions,” (whatever be the judgment of the Clergy upon it, whether favourable or adverse,) shall “be brought into the House of Lords on the very first day of the next Session, and pressed on with all practicable speed,”—I should deem it a very superfluous task to do what you have thought yourself at liberty to tell Dr. Lushington and Lord John Russell that it is probable I shall do.

In conclusion, and as the only comment I shall make on this most extraordinary announcement, I must seriously ask you—Is it possible, that the Clergy at large are not to be deemed worthy of a voice, in a discussion so immediately interesting to them, both on their own account, and on account of the Church? Can you, or I, or any one else, be blind to the absolute certainty, that there must be in that body many, very many, as capable of forming a sound judgment on this subject, as any, or as all, of the Bishops on the Bench? It is manifestly a matter which ought to be submitted to the deliberations of the Clergy in Convocation, in which their voice would be as powerful as ours; and if, for any reasons, good or not good, Convocation is not permitted to sit, it is, in my unalterable judgment, only just, proper, and even decent, that we Bishops should seek to obtain a knowledge of the sentiments of the *Clergy on this great question*, and should represent those sen-

timents to Parliament with all the weight which we can give to them, and to which they are most undeniably entitled.

I am, my dear Lord,  
Very faithfully yours,  
H. EXETER.

*The Lord Bishop of London.*

*St. Germans, 17th August.*

P.S.—Since writing the preceding letter, I have had an opportunity of reading a report of what passed in the House of Commons on Wednesday last. By it, I find that the contingency has occurred, which your last sentence contemplated; the Bill has been “dropped,” and the Clergy, I conclude, must be prepared to see the course which you have been authorised to announce actually pursued. By the same report, I find, that the name of Lord John Russell must be added to those of the Lord Chancellor and yourself, as authorities for the incurable badness of the late Bill. I further find, that, whatever may be thought by us Bishops, the judgment of the Clergy is regarded by at least one distinguished member of the other house as necessary to the due consideration of a measure so immediately affecting them and the Church.

Any letter addressed to me at Exeter will be forwarded to me, though probably it may be rather tardy in reaching me.

(Copy.)

No. 4.

MY DEAR LORD,

*London, 16th August, 1839.*

I HAVE just recollected that your remark to me, as to the smallness of the number who would probably *divide* with you, was made on the occasion of the Ecclesiastical Preferment Suspension, not of the Church Discipline Bill. It is quite immaterial to the point which I had in view; but I think it right to correct the error.

Believe me, my dear Lord,  
Yours faithfully,  
C. J. LONDON.

*To the Lord Bishop of Exeter.*

*Lately published, 8vo., 2s.*

---

**CHARGE**  
**DELIVERED TO THE CLERGY**  
**OF THE**  
**DIOCESE OF EXETER,**  
**BY THE**  
**RIGHT REV. HENRY, LORD BISHOP OF EXETER,**  
**AT HIS TRIENNIAL VISITATION,**  
**In the months of August, September, and October,**  
**1836.**

---

*Also,*  
**SPEECH**  
**OF THE**  
**BISHOP OF EXETER**  
**ON NATIONAL EDUCATION,**  
**IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS,**  
**July 5, 1839.**

Published and Sold by ROAKE and VARTY, 31, Strand.

*(Price 2d., or 12s. per hundred, for distribution.)*

# THE RULE OF FAITH CONSIDERED;

IN A

## C H A R G E

DELIVERED TO

THE CLERGY

OF THE

ARCHDEACONRY OF LONDON,

MAY 16, MDCCCXXXIX.

---



BY THE

VEN. JOSEPH HOLDEN POTT, M.A.

ARCHDEACON OF LONDON;

AND CHANCELLOR OF THE CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF EXETER.

---

PRINTED BY REQUEST OF THE CLERGY PRESENT.

---

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD,

AND WATERLOO PLACE, PALL MALL.

---

1839.

**LONDON :**  
**GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,**  
**ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.**

TO THE REVEREND  
**THE CLERGY**  
OF THE  
ARCHDEACONRY OF LONDON.

IN transcribing this Charge for the press, it has been augmented principally by additions to what was cited from other writers, but with no change of sentiment from what was heard by you, my Reverend Brethren, when the request was made for its being published; and to you it is now inscribed, with every deep impression of regard,

BY ITS AUTHOR.





A

## CHARGE,

&c.

---

MY REV. BRETHREN,

PILATE'S question, What is truth ? may seem to have been a natural query ; but indeed it was one which in his lips showed that he had little knowledge of what he might have known, and was as ill qualified for private judgment in things of moral or religious obligation, as he was for public and judicial causes : insufficient both ways, and too shallow and false-hearted to sit as a learner or a judge.

Truth, indeed, in its comprehensive sense, as first derived from God, who gave the powers of intellect and reason, and who prescribed from the first the lessons proper for them in the first injunction of his sacred Word, speaks, in all ways, its Divine original. Those rays of light and knowledge have accordingly

subsisted in full harmony under the never-erring government of God. I shall crave your attention for a while to the proof of this, before I pass on to the objects which I have in view.

Thus, when God made man, He endowed him with all the powers and privileges proper for his appointed and distinguished station in the universe; without which endowments the objects of the senses would have been no more to man than to the brute. The sovereign Lord vouchsafed at the same time to become his teacher. What else were those communications of which we read in the first pages of the sacred volume? What was the precept which presented the first pledge of homage to the true Proprietor of all things? We cannot suppose that the sum of moral duty was confined to that commandment; and yet that Word was given, although the debt of homage could not fail to be suggested to the reasonable mind from all surrounding objects. The spontaneous efforts of the human mind rise as readily to view in the same scene of man's first existence. Thus when God brought all living things before Adam, to see what he would name them, what was this but the first occasion given for the exercise and trial of man's intellectual powers; and accordingly it follows, "whatsoever Adam called "every living thing, that was the name thereof;" as well as the description, no doubt, of its properties.

Thus if the gift of reason with respect to man was the first privilege bestowed upon him, because without it man was not made, yet the first exercises of it were not left without direction. So true is it that "God teaches man more than the beasts of the field, and maketh him wiser than the fowls of heaven."

There is no rival claim, then, for priority, where the gift of reason and the conscious spirit, with the Word of God for guidance and instruction, and for the assurance of man's best hope, have been found to stand together, and where the perfections of the sovereign Lord have formed the standard and the test of truth. It will be my aim to show how these grounds of truth and knowledge are combined in the written Word of God, the rule of faith, which is the main object which I have in view.

Without reviving old disputes concerning what have been called common notions, certain it is that whatever be the method of receiving or acquiring such conceptions, the reality of that discriminative power must be admitted, and it must be owned that some agreement must evermore subsist between the best convictions of the human mind, and the known and adorable perfections of the sovereign Lord. We may be sure of this, because to his high perfections God makes his own appeal in every treaty with his reasonable creatures. The same conformity therefore between truth and reason must

subsist where binding rules of faith and duty are presented to the reasonable mind. Without these correspondent properties of truth and reason there could be no certainty in any thing; and man would be formed for doubt only and perplexity, and yet would be responsible for the right use of his faculties—or worse than this, he might commit crimes upon false reasonings and false notions of experience, and be blameless.

If a mirror in a dark place reflects nothing, yet bring it out, or let in the light, and you will see that it is not a slab of stone or a wooden tablet; it will reflect the glorious canopy of heaven, with all the wonders of the visible creation. The application is apparent; and all the cavils that perceptions come only by the senses, cannot set aside the existence of discriminative faculties, which is enough for all our purposes; for they correspond, where nothing hinders or debases, with the grounds and principles of truth. A thankless, and an unsuccessful task too, it has been to search the darkest corners of the globe for men merely brutal. “*Nulla gens tam barbara*,” is still as proper in the mouth of Grotius as it was in that of Tully.

We shall thus be able to perceive at once the grounds of moral certainty in the written Word which combines them, without resorting to the fallacious notion of an earthly guide, unerring and infallible; and without seeking any rival word or

supplemental rule to vie with that to which God hath set His seal.

The course pursued by our Lord's Apostle exhibits a clear proof of what has been said, and shall make good the fundamental ground for that which follows, to which I shall then crave your attention. The Apostle did not leave men to challenge secret notices of things for which their own word only must be taken; nor were men left by him to seek traditionary gleanings for the rule of faith. He reminds us, that the first approach to God is by "believing that He is," and that "He is "a rewarder of such as diligently seek Him." Here, as in every instance which deserves the name and titles of religious truth, faith and duty rise together to the view. He who should sever them, (forming as they do together the best reflections from the best and only pattern of all goodness,) must drop all argumentative or rational considerations, and take faith for the proof even of itself; or for that which makes its own claim, and does its own work in some mysterious way, without the exercise of moral properties, (for which, however, the faith of many stands so signally commended by our Lord and His Apostles,) and without any moral process. And what is the moral process concerning that faith which has truth and duty for its objects? St. Paul shall give the answer. He tells us that faith respects the evidence of things not seen; that

it comes by hearing, and by compliance of the mind and heart with what man believeth: it receives the word of God and the call and tender of the Holy Spirit as they are put forward in the great treaty of salvation by God's own appointed and commissioned ministers—it is avowed with the resolute, unfeigned confession of the lips—it works by love, with every cheering expectation of reward—it unites itself to hope and charity, and these three abide together—it has its day of trial, and its season of account. In all these stages of man's course, whether of access, profession, or proficiency, or, on the other hand, of aversion, opposition, or declension, there is the stamp and character of good or bad. Such, my Rev. Brethren, is the generous, noble principle of truth—humble, docile, patient, constant—yet prompt, fearless, resolute, and free. And so groundless is the subtle, sophistical suggestion of the crafty unbeliever, who insinuates calmly that truth can be no more than the mere inclination of the balance as the weight goes down—by which insidious, but false suggestion, he would supersede at once all moral motives and alternatives in the Christian breast, leaving nothing but a man's own word to be taken for that which he believes, or for that which he imposes upon others, perhaps (as we shall see) with the claim of unerring and infallible authority.

A few words will now show in what way the

same Apostle framed his plea in strict conformity to these first laid principles, and will enable me to close this first head of discourse. He collects the rays of natural and revealed light, as the light of heaven was collected, in the first creation, into the sun's orb to give light unto the world. The Apostle, then, treats distinctly both of the existence and of the mind and purposes of God. He shows, therefore, what might be gathered by reason and reflection from the visible creation, even where the first imparted admonitions and instructions had been (as in the heathen world) forgotten : and he points as plainly to what only could be known of the mind and purposes of God by the light of revelation : nor did he fail to show how these twin stems of knowledge grow up together, and thrive together, and lend a mutual support, and supply a common shelter. He appeals, in both respects, to God's own attributes, where again, as at all times, we shall find the standard and the test of truth. He urged these joint pleas with the men of Athens. He reprov'd them for neglecting what their forefathers had known ; reminding them that " God never left " the world without a witness of Himself ;" but that they, professing to be wise, yet neglecting the first step to wisdom, became fools. Again he reprov'd the same ignorant and yet conceited men, for refusing to acknowledge another truth as obvious as the former, namely, that the mind of God, in His



own counsels and designs, could only be known by God Himself, and by those to whom He would reveal them. Their own philosopher had told them this, and they sent him a cup of hemlock for that sound confession; and made that return for the noblest suffrage of the heathen world.

Thus were these vain but audacious cavillers justly taxed by the Apostle with guilt and folly; when, having departed from the first ground of faith, they rejected also that of which they had most need, when it was submitted to their choice, upon sufficient proofs and demonstration that it came from God. And what might be the cause of all this blindness, guilt, and folly? Blind they were, but not altogether so by nature, or they would have had no sin, as our Lord reminded his perverse opponents; but their blindness, in its worst and most culpable degree, consisted in the wilful closing of the eye against what indeed neither they, nor any man, no, nor the saints of light, the holy angels, could see or "know, except it were revealed," concerning the gracious purposes of God. Their guilt and folly (as that of others who in every age act like them) consisted manifestly in this, that they rejected such things as they needed most, when they were declared to them upon sufficient grounds of evidence, merely because they would believe nothing which they could not discover for themselves, by their own accustomed methods of

investigation. There was room enough for observation and for argument. They had convincing demonstrations set before them, to which they could give no answer, and make no objection; but there was room for faith also, and for the trial of heart, for they go together, or where would be the moral character, and where the victories of faith? They were not so mad as the Jews were, to attribute what they saw to Satan, but they cared not for the summons; they were besotted with their own inventions, and bewildered with their empty never-ending speculations.

I have but to treat the remaining point, the pattern of God's own perfections, to which the Apostle made his chief appeal; for that, too, shall not pass without its proof.

That appeal then had been made in all times, by the sovereign Lord himself, in all his dealings, and more particularly with reference both to the word of prophecy and to the works of miracle; in all which there was a perpetual appeal to the acknowledged attributes of God, and therefore to the best use of the faculties of man. Such was God's challenge to false gods and false prophets: "Let them show the things to come;" things which, when they do come to pass, prove both the foresight and the just arbitrement of God. To the same test did our Lord appeal for the confirmation of his miracles, showing, by convincing reasons, that they

were wrought by Divine power, not only because they surpassed all human agency, but because they corresponded in all points to such designs as were altogether worthy of Divine interposition, and calculated to illustrate, before men and angels, the perfections of the sovereign Lord. That noble argument, how firmly has it stood, against men as faithless and more crafty than the Jewish adversary !

I have made these previous observations, because in treating further of the written word of God, as I intend to do, you will find, I trust, that I stand for principles as they form the basis of the written word, and I have therefore laid the first foundations carefully.

If I enter now,<sup>1</sup> with more reluctance and no less diffidence, upon a field of controversy, and shall seem to glance at discussions of that nature now on foot among us, I shall not for a moment attempt to compromise your judgment, my Rev. Brethren, but shall gladly leave that (as indeed I must do, if I were more inclined to dictate than I am) to your discretion ; keeping clear of all personal collisions, when I stand for principles alone : where they are well established, as in the written word of God they are, the surge and the foam of restless billows will spend themselves in vain upon these mounds.

One word, however, ere we turn to controversies, for the poor polemic who labours in that field. He

has a hard part to sustain. If you bid him look rather to the plainest and the best things, that (if his mind be right and sound) is just what he wishes most to do: they are the first principles of our common faith; the fittest, surely, for the work of public teaching and persuasion. It is not the war of strife which he desires. It is the simplest form of faith which he wishes to restore. He is not the champion of opinions; he dips lower to the sure foundations: but he must, as hard occasion may require, employ his pains to clear those foundations from what may have been heaped upon them. He has indeed the hardest task to execute; for men are much more ready to give praise and credit to the guide who does but follow where the path is cleared. They forget what is due to the hand and implements which are called in to that difficult and irksome toil.

The Jewish captive of old time, and the British yoke-men of imperious Cæsar's, had the hardest task to undergo; and when the street was laid by their exertions, the centurions and the legion might go forward easily enough. Will you say there was no praise due (though some compassion) where there was no voluntary toil? But there must be those to labour freely in such toils for the sake of others. Beware how you condemn the work: it was our blessed Lord's own care and pains to clear off the rubbish which the Scribe and Pharisee had heaped

upon the path of truth ; and, accordingly, the prophet, who looked forward to that happy, yet stupendous labour, sang the song of praise.

I am not so well inclined to take part with the theorist, and should pass him silently at this time; were it not for some particulars which fall in with what I have said concerning first principles, and what I have yet to say concerning newly furbished schemes again brought forward.

With reference then to the main ground, which forms, indeed, the standard and the test of truth, I have often wondered greatly, that some eminently learned men, who never for a moment questioned the fulness and perfection of the known attributes of the sovereign Lord, should have taken up such partial views, and built theories upon them. What a strange strife it has been to contend as the fabled knights, who fought for what they saw but on one side of the pillar, when, if they had gone fairly round it, they would gladly have joined hands to defend it against all assailants. It has seemed to me surprising to find one contending for the sovereign will of God ; another, for His wisdom ; a third, for His benevolence ; a fourth, for His truth. I could name the champions<sup>1</sup>, but they are well known to you, and it is enough to say, with much deference to those great men, that they were all right

<sup>1</sup> Warburton, Balguy, Grove, and Wollaston.

in some respects, but too much wedded to restrictive theories. And the same remark will serve for some of those revived conceits, which for the mischief they may breed among us, I am loth to pass unnoticed.

One of the surest rules, then, in theology and in ethics, appears to me to be this—that no one virtue should occupy the place which is designed for many. Try the manifold varieties of theoretical obliquities by this rule, and you will not fail to find their fallacy: it will manifest itself on the one side by defect, or on the other by excess. Try it in the newly favoured schemes and models of ascetical restrictions. They have starved more virtues than they ever reared or could produce; they put the means for the end; they make self-denial a perfection in itself, to be valued for its own sake, though it can be but the remedy for what requires to be corrected; and medicine is not food, and if persisted in beyond its uses, becomes poison. Self-denial, where it is proper, as it often must be, is but the means for establishing, what is far better, the government of self-control: even, as repentance itself is but in order to a sound and practical amendment. Defects or excesses in such cases, will cramp or preclude the exercise of many a noble disposition of the heart and mind—and instead of fighting round the pillar for what is written but one side, we shall see the pillar-saint mounting to

its summit to endure, day after day, the burnings of an Eastern sky, when he might have been better far employed, and when he was surpassed too in self-torment, and is so this day, by the blind and abject devotees of heathen superstition. What a life must that be which consists in such things; when, indeed, it is the glory of the Christian life to make some progress in that which shall exercise the noblest disposition of the mind and heart in future scenes of blessedness.

Try by the same rule of just proportions, the case of voluntary vows, which, if they do not turn to snares, as they are most apt to do, must want that which is the soul of virtue in all its forms, the generous exercise of free discretion, which will never yield to change the moral motive, and becoming use of things, for the fetter and the fixed resolve with all its scruples and embarrassments. Try the rule again, where the strange distinction has been made by some, by which moral virtues, truly such, and neither counterfeit in kind, nor wanting by defect, nor urged beyond their due place and proportion by excess, have been distinguished from Christian virtues, and cast out for that reason.

Can there be a grosser libel on the Christian code of ethics, than that which excludes from it any real virtue? In this mangled scheme, the copy would not answer to the pattern, for in that all perfect model every hallowed attribute subsists in abso-

lute and never-broken harmony. I have not then wandered from my point in these preliminary observations, and the best reply to those maimed and distorted images of truth and virtue, may be gathered from those beautiful, distinct, and ample recapitulations of the rule of duty, as well as that of faith, in the apostolic writings; they shine there as the brightest constellations in our heaven, and they will shine for ever in the heaven of heavens.

We may remark now, in pursuing the main object which I have in view, that the first revelations which God vouchsafed to make, were made with His own mouth; and, therefore, they left no room for doubt. There was no need for further evidence for such grounds of faith. But was it so in times which followed? Surely not. The Apostles, though inspired of God, had to state the evidence of faith to those who had the first gifts of God for their discernment, and for their furtherance the promise of His gracious succours, which were never wanting to His word, and without which no one step can be set forward rightly, in all the course we have to run. In ordinary cases the Apostle's counsel was to compare spiritual things with spiritual, and to mark their agreement with the known perfections of the Deity; "to prove" all things, and to hold fast what is good." They then, who had received the word itself from inspired Apostles, had no need of the same immediate revelations which the first commissioned witnesses en-



joyed for the sake of others; for they were not exempt from days of trial on their own account, or their privilege would have destroyed the value of their reasonable service in all its branches. From thenceforth the promised guidance of the Holy Spirit in sufficient measures, and the well laid grounds of faith, left no ground for expecting more immediate revelations, or for two or more infallible authorities.

Excellent are the words of Bishop Stillingfleet to this effect—"I grant," saith he to his opponent, "that faith is an assent to things absolutely true; but here I distinguish the infallible authority of God revealing (into which my faith is resolved, as into the formal reason of it), from the authority of the Church conveying this revelation, which is only the means by which the revelation comes to be known to us." He shows that what is said of Scripture, as not being of private interpretation, relates to the inspiration by which it was given, and not to any exercise of Church authority; and that the pillar and ground of faith, relates to the Apostles and Evangelists, and to the written word received and transmitted by the Church.

Thus the well-laid ground of faith hath left no place for a perpetual oracle on earth to require implicit credence, to resolve all doubts, and to fix all points of belief; to determine the sense or decide the purport of the sacred word. To pretend

to this, is at once to assume a privilege above the written word itself; for he who challenges to himself the last resort, most clearly sets himself in the highest place: and an infallible authority, if it could be proved, might well challenge all appeals; for, indeed, it would be God's own authority: and this shows the vanity and arrogance of that portentous challenge. It was made some ages after the early councils had very providently fixed the boundaries for extent and jurisdiction of the see of Rome, with no single hint or imagination of any paramount authority. They were councils not convened by the bishops of that church, nor confirmed by them; councils, in the midst of which the volume of the sacred Scriptures was set up as the rule of faith, the sole ground of appeal. The proud claim alluded to was first made by an Eastern bishop, and was rejected with disdain and indignation by the Roman pontiff; but it was, however, not long after, challenged by a successor of him by whom it was so justly reprobated. This incumbrance, heaped by degrees upon the word itself, required therefore first to be removed, in order to clear the rule of faith from that which would oppress it and turn the thoughts of men another way. It is scarcely needful for me to remind you, my Rev. Brethren, that to set up two authorities, both claiming to be infallible, would be to destroy the ground of all religious truth as effectually as to

deny the unity of God. It would require, indeed, the self-same arguments for its refutation. Thus, if the Church, not contented with its just authority as a witness and a guide, should pretend to be infallible, it must resolve its claim into a divine prerogative. It cannot receive authority from the written word itself, and then prescribe to that; for this (as has been often shown) would be to prove one thing by another, and then that other by the thing so proved, which is a circulating argument, and proves nothing.

The divine word was delivered with full evidence and public demonstrations of its truth. It was given in a manner suitable to the faculties of those to whom it was declared; and thus we can easily perceive what it is to have God and His word for the rule of faith, and how inconsistent, nay, how impossible, it is to have other masters, who cannot give the like proofs of their unerring privilege, or establish other grounds of faith. Try this, if you think fit, in the case of any rival standard, or of any supplemental rule for which men have contended. The same result of things incompatible, and of conflicting and distracting claims, will as certainly appear. If there be any place for a joint authority of this kind to suggest or to supply what is still needful, it must infer deficiency in some respect. That which borrows any needful confirmation or fixed meaning from another, must indicate

its own defect. How different is this from the privilege to teach and minister what is first learned, and for which, in men so qualified, a sacred office and commission is conferred, and a duty laid on others to seek truth at their lips; but not as lords over their faith and consciences, as infallible interpreters would be. Can we think that the word inspired of God to be the rule of faith and duty to all men, can need inspired interpreters, for such they must be if infallible; or that it can endure perpetual oracles of this kind thus set above it? Could such lines of truth be the lively oracles of God, with no breath in them but that of others? Is it tradition which is so called in to this end? What was that in its earliest day, when, indeed, it had authority to speak for God, by the lips of the Apostles before the word was written? and how long did it retain that plenary authority? The answer to these two queries is soon made, and will go far to determine this whole controversy. The surest word, then, of all tradition which can be produced from the earliest writers after those who were inspired of God, shall furnish the reply. It is in substance this: that what the Apostles, after Christ's example, first taught by word of mouth, they committed in due time to writing, or caused to be written by their directions, in order that for all things necessary to salvation there might be no need of any further testimonies, and no risk of

mis-reporting or forgetting what had been delivered. If, then, you prize traditionary notices, as you well may within due limits, you will gladly hear what the earliest writers have testified on this head. They never claimed to be infallible, though superior far in credit to those who in an age much later made that claim. We revere their testimonies in proportion to their real value and acknowledged uses. Irenæus, then, states the matter most distinctly, when, having spoken of what the Apostles taught, he adds concerning it, “postea per Dei voluntatem in scripturis tradiderunt, fundamentum et columnam fidei nostræ futurum<sup>1</sup>.” St. Austin in his day said the same thing as plainly. Speaking of our blessed Lord he says, “quicquid enim de suis dictis aut factis nos legere voluit, scribendum illis (scilicet Apostolis), tanquam suis manibus, imperavit<sup>2</sup>.” So far were those faithful confessors from thinking that there was any other rule of faith.

And, therefore, what St. Austin said elsewhere, which is so often quoted, and so often misapplied, “Evangelio non crederem nisi me commoverat Ecclesiæ autoritas,” can refer only to the reception and transmission of the sacred canon of the Scripture by the Church. The Church is the wit-

<sup>1</sup> Irenæus, lib. iii. cap. 1.

<sup>2</sup> De consensu Evangel. lib. i. cap. 35.

ness and depository of the sacred oracles ; and St. Austin shows what is due to her upon that account. It is one thing to be a writer or inditer of authoritative doctrine, (and such were the Apostles,) and it is another thing to receive those documents and to transmit them, and this the Church hath done. They who confound these things may set the authority of the Church above the Scriptures, or place it on a level with them ; but this was not St. Austin's meaning, as might be proved by many testimonies from his own writings, and by as many more from those of others, which cannot be mistaken.

Again, the answer to the second query, How long was the word entrusted to traditional notices ? may as soon be given. "The gospel of St. Matthew," says Whitby, "was written eight years after our Lord's ascension ; St. Mark's, whilst St. Peter (whose comrade he was) was yet alive ; St. Luke's, fifteen years after the ascension of our Lord ; and St. John's, not more than thirty years after the same period." This leaves but a small space for tradition in its plenary authority before the word was written and became the rule of faith, with a woe denounced against those who should add thereto, or detract from it. What St. Austin thought of such attempts beyond the things left free to the discretion of each Church, is plain from these remarkable words of his : "*quod autem instituitur præter consuetudinem ut quasi observatio*

“ sacramenti sit, approbare non possum; etiamsi  
 “ multa ejusmodi propter nonnullarum vel sanc-  
 “ tarum vel turbulentarum personarum scandala  
 “ devitanda, liberius improbare non audeo. Sed  
 “ hoc nimis doleo quia tam multis præsumptionibus  
 “ plena sunt omnia<sup>1</sup>.”

There is a passage not less remarkable on this head in the writings of St. Chrysostom, where he brings in an heathen complaining to him of the different questions which were raised upon the Scriptures themselves. Now here you would certainly expect St. Chrysostom to say “ hear the Church ;” and in some respects he might have said so very properly ; but this heathen did come, it seems, to one who was a faithful guide and pastor of the Church ; one who had his privilege to teach, which they who seek the truth or love it, are bound at all times to respect. But what was the answer of this faithful guide ? He tells the heathen that the Scriptures were plain enough in all things needful, and he adds this significant reproof<sup>2</sup>, *οὐκ ἔχετε, οὐδὲ κρίνιν* ; “ have you no judgment of “ your own ?” words conformable to those of our blessed Lord, “ why of your own selves judge you “ not what is right ?” Excellent, again, are the words of Bp. Stillingfleet. Having said, that “ the “ unity of the faith delivered by the Apostles was

<sup>1</sup> Epis. ad Jan. 119. cap. 19.

<sup>2</sup> Hom. 33. tom. 4.

“ the more sure because without the help of a  
 “ written rule they so unanimously agreed in the  
 “ doctrines they delivered,” he then makes these  
 beautiful and just remarks, “ when the Gospels  
 “ were written there were some counterfeit and  
 “ false gospels dispersed abroad under the names  
 “ of the Apostles themselves. How came these to  
 “ be rejected, and the others to be so carefully  
 “ received ? The true advantage of original tradi-  
 “ tion before the Gospels were written lay in this,  
 “ that by it the several churches were enabled to  
 “ pass a true judgment concerning the written  
 “ Gospels when they came to be dispersed among  
 “ them ; for they could presently tell whether what  
 “ they read were agreeable to what they had heard  
 “ and received from the Apostles.” He shows how  
 well this served “ to overthrow any pretence to a  
 “ secret tradition from the Apostles, different from  
 “ what was seen in the Apostolical writings ; and  
 “ to this purpose Irenæus and Tertullian made  
 “ very good use of the tradition of the Apostolical  
 “ Churches against the pretenders to such a tra-  
 “ dition which those churches were not acquainted  
 “ with.” And then follows an admirable observa-  
 tion with respect to the question of the time or  
 duration of authoritative tradition before the word  
 was written. “ It was,” saith he, “ most agreeable  
 “ to the Divine Wisdom in providing for a constant



“ establishment of the faith of the Church in all  
 “ ages, neither to permit the Gospels to be written  
 till the churches were planted,” (of which he had  
 before assigned the reason,) “ nor to put off the  
 “ writing to another generation ; for then it would  
 “ have been plausibly objected, if these things were  
 “ true, why were they not recorded when there  
 “ were persons living who were best able to have  
 “ proved or confuted them.

“ There was no disagreement,” saith this excellent writer, “ so much as mentioned as to what the  
 “ Apostles themselves taught. They had one body,  
 “ one Spirit, one Lord, one baptism, one God and  
 “ Father of all. Wherever the Apostles went,  
 “ whether into Scythia, Parthia, Mesopotamia, or  
 “ any province of the Roman empire, all who were  
 “ converted by them were baptized into the same  
 “ faith, which St. Jude calls the faith once delivered  
 “ to the saints, though by many persons ; and so  
 “ once delivered as that the same faith is to continue to the world’s end ; for nothing can be  
 “ made the faith of Christ which was not always so,  
 “ for that were to lay a new foundation, and to  
 “ make another covenant than what Christ hath  
 “ sealed with his blood. But He is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever ; and if Vincentius  
 “ would confine his rule, quod semper, quod ubique,  
 “ quod ab omnibus, to what he finds in the Apos-

“ tles’ writings, and can trace, neither more or less, “ in all the churches, his rule were excellent and of “ universal obligation.”

The same judicious writer makes elsewhere this reply to those who triumphed in the text where the traditions are so expressly commended to the Thesalonians, “ that at that time the Gospels were not “ written ;” and there ends that boast. He fails not to produce what the Apostles and Evangelists assign for the motive for their pains in this respect, “ that every one might know certainly the things in “ which they were instructed ;” and again, “ these “ things were written that ye might believe that “ Jesus is the Son of God, and that believing ye “ might have life through his name.”

“ I might insist,” saith he, “ on many instances “ in the first ages of the Church, scarcely any of “ which can be produced, where they pleaded mere “ tradition but they were mistaken ; as about the “ millennium, the age of Christ, the time of Easter, “ the communicating infants. What cause, then,” saith he, “ have we to be thankful to God, that He “ hath taken so much care of His Church as to “ provide us an infallible written rule in His Holy “ Scriptures, whereby we may certainly know what “ the true primitive Christianity was <sup>1</sup>.”

In another noble treatise of the same writer he

<sup>1</sup> Bp. Stillingfleet’s Sermon at Guildhall.

puts this cogent question: "What had they to do  
 " to try the spirits, whether they be of God or not,  
 " or to prove any thing of themselves, if the judg-  
 " ment in matters of faith were so given to the  
 " Church that others without further inquiry are  
 " bound to submit to its sentence? The point," he  
 adds, "is this, whether, according to the primitive  
 " Church, when any controversy about the faith  
 " doth arise, a person be bound to submit to the  
 " sentence of the Church as infallible, or required  
 " to make use of the best means he can to judge  
 " concerning it, taking the Scriptures for his infal-  
 " lible guide<sup>1</sup>." To all the clamour of the Church  
 of Rome on this head, he answers, "these objec-  
 " tions do not reach us of the Church of England,  
 " which receives the three creeds, and embraces the  
 " four general councils, and professes to hold nothing  
 " contrary to any universal tradition of the Church."  
 Adding, "we have often offered to put the contro-  
 " versies between us and the Church of Rome upon  
 " this issue. We received," saith he, "the Scrip-  
 " tures from universal tradition, derived from all  
 " the apostolical churches, and so the creeds and  
 " the councils, and such an universal tradition is  
 " the thing we desire; but as for the Trent creed,  
 " our forefathers never knew or received it as  
 " part of that faith without which there is no sal-  
 " vation."

<sup>1</sup> Stillingfleet's answer to Sargent.

I cannot quit the reasonings of this excellent divine without another reference to his writings. Thus concerning the written word he says, "it was " the way which God Himself made choice of where " the reason for tradition was stronger. I mean as " to the ten commandments, which were short and " plain, and easy to be remembered, and perfectly " agreeable to the sense and general interest of " mankind; yet the all-wise God, who perfectly " understood the nature of man, would not leave " the ten commandments to an oral tradition." He adds, our Saviour's own appeal "in his disputes " with the Jews, was, 'Search the Scriptures;' run " not to your traditions. Had ye believed Moses " ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me; " but if ye believed not his writings how shall ye " believe my word?"

"Whatever," says this distinguished writer, "we " truly understand of the ages before us, we are " beholden to writing for it. All those memorable " acts and institutions, either of philosophy or religion, which were not written, were long since " buried in oblivion, without the possibility of a " resurrection<sup>1</sup>."

But to pursue my purpose. The Church, by its appointed and commissioned ministers, is the guardian of the living well of waters. The power is

<sup>1</sup> Stillingfleet's answer to J. S.

given to draw for all ; but the sacred spring possesses its own virtue ; and surely none can be so blind, or so far mistaken, as not to know when the water is clear and bright, and when it is clouded or polluted. “ The well is deep, and thou hast nothing “ to draw withal,” was well urged, but wholly misapplied, by the woman of Samaria ; but they who draw for all, are entrusted, and enabled for that end, to give them what is theirs by right ; the gift of their common Father, the Founder of the well, who provides that adequate supply for all ; and as there is a right of use, so is there a common right of custody, even as there is common interest in the body of the Church.

Where infallible authority is claimed by those who yet can bring no proof of their title to it, such authority requires implicit faith in those who will submit to it ; but that was a way which God did not take with His reasonable creatures, and which our Lord and His Apostles never took. God laid the trains of evidence from age to age for that which should hereafter be believed, and our Lord and His Apostles made their appeal even in the miracles which they wrought, to the end and purpose of the work. In the first pledge of salvation there was no need (as we have seen) for this course to be taken, for God spake with His own mouth, and the first pair who had received such communications knew well who it was that spake to them. And so again,

when the first family stood beside God's altar in the new scene of discipline and trial to which they were so graciously consigned when the forfeiture incurred might have been taken—then it was that the prevaricating brother of the faithful Abel received of God that memorable admonition, “If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? but if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door.” The trial of the heart and the moral ground of faith come in here, and remain for ever in full force. No word of revelation ever superseded that assurance; it was spoken of the sovereign Lord with his own mouth, as the first pledge of salvation had been, and descends together with it to every generation of mankind: it stands as firmly as the moral government of God, the moral Ruler of the universe.

But I shall dwell no longer on the preposterous claim to two infallible authorities, or to traditionary notices of like value. Let “quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus,” be the challenge for traditionary testimonies, and we shall never shrink from that test: but what will they do who have to bring their feigned antiquities to that criterion? Whitby tells us, that “the invocation of saints was introduced in the fifth century by the Patriarch of Antioch; purgatory by Pope Gregory in the sixth; the title of universal head by Boniface in the seventh; image worship by the second Nicene Council in the eighth; transubstantiation by Pas-

“chasius in the ninth; the number of seven sacraments by Lombard and Hugo de St. Victor in the twelfth; and the adoration of the host by Pope Hadrian in the thirteenth<sup>1</sup>.”

If these things come first before us for removal as the first pretence for turning men from that only word to which God hath set His seal for the rule of faith, I shall dwell on them no longer, they are so palpable and so well known to you, but shall advert only to what has indeed been often urged, that they who agree but in this, that such an oracle may and must be found, because they think it convenient that it should be so, though, in fact, it would destroy the genuine properties of faith as much as inerrable security in life and manners, which might seem to them as convenient, would destroy the trial of man's service. They who make this supposition, and found such claims upon it, should show if it were ever so in Israel, or in all the world. The high priest's breast-plate will not help them, for that was consulted not for points of faith or matters of the law, but for resolution in civil exigences, peace, or war. They should likewise come to some agreement where we are to find this oracle. One whole order, who of all men are the most devoted to the papal chair, with perhaps the Italian bishops, send us by a course straight enough to the Roman

<sup>1</sup> Whitby on Tradition.

Pontiff; but two councils take up the challenge, and put themselves above the papal head, and so far made their words good by putting down two several popes for heresy, and setting up a third. The next device is for the decrees of general councils confirmed by the pope: but none of the first general councils were convened by the Roman patriarch, or graced by his presence, or confirmed by his authority; they never dreamed of such a warrant; they had the Scriptures for their rule, and most certainly they could not find it there. They gave the reason why Constantinople should have equal rank and equal privileges with old Rome, because Constantinople became the seat of empire as Rome had been. The next plea then is for the Church diffusive; and here all vanishes in one blended figure, and the castle must be built upon the circumambient air. The rock of the Divine word is alike deserted in all these schemes. Do but put these several titles of pope, council, pope and council, church diffusive, on one dye with a common spindle; spin it, and all vanishes; but wait a little, and one will turn up plain and legible enough. Spin again, and another will come up as plainly. This is no fable, but just what has happened. One thing is clear, that when infallible pretensions came in, the Scriptures were cast into a corner, or forced from the hands of millions, and with this self-condemning discrepancy, that what



was allowed (by special licence) by one pope was revoked soon after by another. This was plain dealing; and the Trent council closed the game, and dashed the hopes of all the states of Europe, with their sovereigns, and riveted for ever the chain forged by infallible pretences; leaving no alternative for those who would not yield to such usurped dominion, but the resolute assertion of their own rights.

But I have to look now to things more specious. The wheel of time, which in its revolutions brings again from the bottom to the top the same spoke or the same nail, finds still the same employment for the poor polemic. Yes, if things of comparatively little moment, things not necessary to salvation, things not declared in Scripture, things dropped or exploded, must again be raked together from traditionary notices; or if what is only doubtful makes new claims to divide the hearts of men, the poor polemic must renew his heavy task, whether he gets thanks for his pains or not.

I shall not dwell long upon such topics; there is no room left me now for producing conflicting testimonies from the earlier writers, and often from the self-same father, under different circumstances and impressions.

I shall observe, then, that the generous and noble spirit with which our Church conducted the reformation of its own household, by its own autho-

rity, led on by prelates and pastors of its own communion, was manifest in the care taken to avoid offence, and to preserve the bond of union in its own fold, with much charity and goodwill for the weak. It was the pastor's part to keep the flock together by the voice of truth ; to fan the smoking flax, and not to blow the fires of persecution ; to cast out nothing which could safely be retained ; to avoid all that could aggravate the clear necessity for rejecting glaring usurpations and gross errors, which had been forced upon us in common with the Western world, not without repeated opposition, as the statutes of the realm bear witness. This generous, firm, but cautious and considerate temper, might well induce our own authorities to retain everything which had the countenance of ancient usage, and which was not repugnant to the Sacred Scriptures. Well then might they retain the general suffrages which testify the perpetual and (even by death) unbroken interest subsisting in the fellowship of saints. The Christian Creed commended this for perpetual regard, and accordingly our joint confession is, that " the souls of the faithful, after " they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, " are in joy and felicity ;" and our joint prayer is, that " we, together with them, may have our perfect " consummation and bliss in that eternal and ever- " lasting glory which Christ hath prepared for us by " His blood and merits."

The enjoyment of rest and of hopeful expectations in a separate state, is recognised in that parable, which, like all others from our Lord's lips, had a ground of truth, when plainer speech was ill-suited to the craft and malice of many of His hearers. Again, that plain word of assurance given by our Lord to the penitent companion in His sufferings, looks the same way, and with a stronger sanction of reality. Our Church, then, might well be induced to continue such general expressions, consistent with such grounds of faith, and to retain them in her Liturgy and Offices. But another course has been pursued with reference to some nearer approximations to prayer and supplication for the dead, for which no warrant has been found but a solitary text, borrowed from a page which has no place in the canon of the written word, however profitable to be read, as containing many excellent and edifying precepts and reflections.

A different course, then, has been taken with reference to our Liturgy as confirmed for public use in an early period of the Reformation, in which a passage kept its place, which might be strained, against the will of our reformers, to countenance the gross error of a late age of the Christian era, which puts no period to the day of trial, when the night comes when no man can work. At that door came in the false conceit of partial satisfactions by penal sufferings and purging fires; a notion manifestly

borrowed from the heathen, and carried farther than they ventured, by the groundless supposition that the prayers of the Church or of surviving friends could shorten that term of fancied expiation, or in more hopeful cases, could procure new consolations for departed spirits. This practice can find no countenance from the prayers for one another in the days of pilgrimage and trial, but is in the main so flatly repugnant to the word of Scripture, which exhibits one only satisfactory atonement, once made, for sin, that well might the subsequent revisions of our Liturgy drop, though but in silence, what might be perverted to countenance what it never could intend. I will say no more on this head, than to question greatly the propriety of that plea which was urged in a past age, and not with any good success or general approbation, for restoring any portion of what had been omitted in the last revision of the Liturgy, upon sufficient reasons we may well believe; for surely that respect is due to the Rulers of our household.

The next point, which is again put forward after days and nights of slumber, seeks its ground also from traditionary sources, and from the writings of the Fathers. It has had for its advocates men of great worth and learning, men who never aimed for a moment at the repetition and renewal of the one sufficient Sacrifice once offered, to which the sacred word of Scripture so decidedly confines our view;

but they took up the notion of a material sacrifice of another kind, of which the Fathers were by them supposed to speak. Thus, although they were the resolute opposers of such as pretend a repetition of the sacrifice of expiation, yet the word oblations, in their view, takes a greater latitude, as they find it used in many testimonies of the early writers. They conceived such expressions to relate to a proper work of sacrifice, though but of the elements of bread and wine. Certain it is that many testimonies for and against disputed topics may be found in the same tomes of the same Fathers. I do not say this in order to impeach the honour of those justly venerated men. I regret, most deeply, the injury which they have sustained; first, by being invested with an authority which they constantly, one and all, disclaimed; and then by the pains taken (not by the candid, cordial, sound polemic, although he may be constrained to show what those faithful confessors so freely owned, that they could err; and often that they had erred; but) by the wanton, rude, and often spiteful cavillers, who have sought to wound the credit of those holy men, and to expose their failings. I delight not in the sometimes needful task of the poor polemic, and I abhor and detest the sacrilegious scorn of the malicious scoffer. But in a better spirit, I humbly hope, I will venture, from known facts, to observe, that I do not wonder in the least that many a

proselyte should have been gained by those who compass sea and land to make one proselyte, by turning craftily to some single pages of such volumes, when, if they would turn the leaves backward or forward, other testimonies, which they take care to conceal, would strip them of their prize.

Let a skilful advocate for traditionary doctrines invite a promising and well-educated youth into his library, and take down a selected volume of the Fathers, and say, my young friend, you have some skill in the learned languages, what do you think of this passage, does it not confirm our judgment, and condemn your guides? It does indeed, may be the answer. Well then, says the subtle disputant, you see how you have been kept in ignorance; you got the Scriptures from these holy men, and will you not believe them on their own word? He must be something of a polemic who can make the proper answer and say, the Fathers do not claim, and never had the same authority with the word of Scripture, though they might give their aid to help us to the knowledge of them. If they could give weight to the testimonies of our Lord and his Apostles, and decide their sense, they would set themselves at once above them; and if such a succession of interpreters had been provided, no doubt the Scriptures had been, if not needless, wholly subject to their dictates. Besides, some of the expositions of these Fathers have

been abandoned and condemned by yourselves, and by all the Christian world ; and many usages also, which subsisted in past ages, were changed or discontinued. But not finding such interruption, the search proceeds.—Here, says the busy advocate, is another testimony to the same effect. Why, then, it must be so : and so the book is closed. But the same volume, fairly searched, might tell a different tale, and with this advantage, which, well applied, will enable us to make short work with the point in question,—the material sacrifice in Christian Churches, as it is thought to be contained in the suffrages of the Fathers. The advantage, then, lies here—the Fathers often speak rhetorically, and in phrases borrowed from accustomed habits, both of thought and language. Yet when the point is plainly set before them for their judgment, they speak plainly to it. Who but remembers what St. Austin said in such a case, reminding us that when any word of Scripture seems to command what is criminal, there we must look to the figurative sense. And who but will applaud the common maxim, that it behoves us to explain and qualify obscure passages, or such perhaps as are only true in some respects, by those which are plain, and cannot be mistaken or misconstrued. Now to apply these observations as briefly as I may be able, in a matter of much moment, to apply them to the case of a material sacrifice in the Christian Church, I shall

avail myself of what was long since answered on this head by an able polemic of our Church. He remarked, that the chief writer in our reformed Church, who appeared for this opinion, was the very learned and justly honoured Mr. Mede, who yet confesses repeatedly that the Fathers who helped him to this notion, call almost anything an offering and a sacrifice ; and that nothing can be more confused, perplexed, and intricate than what (unweeingly, no doubt,) they clothe with the names of sacrifices and oblations. Nor does Mr. Mede keep clear, as might be expected, of their inconsistencies. “ Upon a diligent reading of his discourses,” says Dr. Hancock, “ I cannot see but that he has left it as intricate and perplexed as he found it ; he gives so many and various, and I think I may say, contrary accounts, that for aught I see, any of them may be false. I am sure all of them cannot be true. Thus, in some places he seems to make it only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, in the sense that our Church calls it so,—in others, an eucharistical or euctical offering ; in others, a true and proper peace-offering ; in others, he goes higher yet, and makes it a true propitiatory sacrifice : accordingly, sometimes he seems to derive this oblation from the offertory before the sacrament, as if this were enough to make it a sacrifice. But, however, sacrifice there must be ; and seeming to despair of his desire in this, he tells us that the very



“ placing of the elements upon the holy table is  
 “ enough to make them a sacrifice. This is indeed  
 “ to make sure work, for they must be placed upon  
 “ the table—and whatever is separated to any holy  
 “ use, may, according to this notion, be a sacrifice.

“ It is very well worth our observation,” saith Dr. Hancock, “ what is acknowledged by Anastasius, “ that the first pope who put the word sacrifice into “ the Latin Liturgy was Leo the First ; as, also, that “ it is acknowledged by the learned Menardus, that “ the form that is now in use in the ordination of “ the priests of the Church of Rome, *accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium Deo*, is not in any of the “ old sacramentaries ; which shows that this notion “ of the sacraments being a sacrifice, is bñt a new “ thing in the Latin Church. I may add (saith he) “ another thing out of the same Menardus, that the “ old form of oblation in the Latin Church, plainly “ refers to the oblation made by the people, and “ therefore only runs, *quæ tibi offerunt* ; but afterwards, when the notion of a sacrifice was brought “ in, it was altered to what it is now, *pro quibus tibi offerimus*.”

The same author shows, that when the Pagan adversaries keenly urged upon the first apologists for Christianity, that the Christian Church had no sacrifice, and no sacrificing priests, they confessed it most distinctly ; they gloried in it ; they testified before all men, that there was but one sufficient

Sacrifice for sin, made and finished on the cross, and commemorated and applied, in all its beneficial influences and effects, in Christ's own ordinance ;— they declared, that the Christian sacrifices were altogether spiritual ; sacrifices of thanksgiving, prayer, and praise ; the tender of the whole man, the sacrifice of soul and body, to the service of the Lord.

The Fathers speak, indeed, very frequently with great contempt of all material sacrifices, as things indulged only for the hardness of men's hearts. Such strong testimonies would require to be well qualified, if other testimonies of the same writers did not speak more honourably of the hallowed types of our Redeemer's one sufficient sacrifice ; but that reason being satisfied, could the Fathers dream of continuing a material sacrifice without such reason ?

Dr. Hancock observes, with much force and acuteness, that Julian, who must have known the practice of the Church of which he was once a member, makes this very objection ; and Justin Martyr, who, in his Second Apology to Antoninus, discourses largely on the Sacrament, never puts that solemn rite in answer to the objection, which surely he must have done, had he entertained the notion that it was, in any sense, a material sacrifice.

The same writer quotes the following testimonies from the Fathers in his own words :—“ We are not “ Atheists (says Justin) though we do not sacrifice :

“ we are persuaded that God does not need a material sacrifice. And again, Prayers and thanksgiving are the only perfect sacrifices. Tertullian says, We do not sacrifice for the emperor, for we do not sacrifice for ourselves ; and again, We sacrifice with pure prayer.” He adds like testimonies from Origen, Clemens Alexandrinus, Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Theodoret. To the same effect, another learned writer <sup>1</sup> of our Church, of the same day, filled a volume with accumulated testimonies to the same effect.

Dr. Hancock winds up his argument in these words, which point once more to the difference between rhetorical or general expressions, and plain testimonies spoken directly to the point. “ Now, certainly,” says Dr. Hancock, “ he must have a very mean opinion of the judgment and discretion of the Fathers, who can think, that if they had then believed that the Sacrament, and the bread and wine therein, was a true and material sacrifice, they would never have once mentioned it, by way of answer to that great objection, both of Jews and Gentiles, that the Christians had no altars and no sacrifices.”

He refers for the sense of our Church to its Homily on the Sacrament, and cites these words from it : “ Neither can he be devout that otherwise

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Wise, Præbendary of Canterbury.

“doth presume” (*of the sacrament*) “than as it was given by its Author: we must therefore take heed lest of the memory” (*or memorial*) “it be made a sacrifice.”

Excellent are the words of the great Lord Falkland, “When,” says he, “the reasons offered for or against a practice, have in them some appearance of truth or probability, as they have to many persons, though they be really of no value; when also the persons authorizing or approving them are of great authority or credit in the Church, as they may be, especially in darker ages, and yet be subject to great errors,—and when the people upon whom these doctrines or practices are pressed, have either great veneration or esteem for those who press them, or a great dread of them,—then meet together most of the things which tend to work persuasion, or prevail for our assent to the doctrine, or compliance with the practice recommended. Seeing then, as Petrus de Marca informs us, the approbation of the half communion by Aquinas, made others entertain the same opinion, why might not others, of as great authority and credit, be instrumental in producing like changes in other constitutions of the Church<sup>1</sup>?”

For all this there is but one remedy—the word of God. Shall we send the well-disposed, the single-

<sup>1</sup> Lord Falkland, quoted by Whitby.

hearted, and the teachable, into woods and forests, to search for berries, or to dig for roots, when they may have the bread of life and the clusters of the true vine brought to their own board? Shall we compel the honest and sincere Bercean to turn over more volumes than would fill the largest room, when he may carry in his hand the volume of the sacred Scriptures, and store its treasures in his bosom? Much praise, no doubt, and much regard, are due those who have qualified themselves, in the field of learning and by long study, to attain a better knowledge of the original languages of the sacred Scripture, and of the grounds of solid criticism, than the early confessors might have: but those faithful witnesses did very much; they left a thousandfold more benefit, both by their examples and their writings, than may compensate slips and misconceptions, which none but misconceited and ungrateful men delight to hold up to scorn. Much praise, then, and regard are due to those who can turn the volumes of the Fathers to advantage, and have the welcome leisure for the purpose; those who become acquainted thus with what has been said, or done, or written in past ages. There will not cease to be the want of such men in the Church, since, as Solomon observes, there is nothing new under the sun, at least in the rambles of the human mind; and if all books were cast into the sea, as some have wished, in the spirit of him who burned

the manuscripts of Alexandria, yet might the same things come up again. Many men have, indeed, unwittingly revived such things, and have taken them to be their own, and been derided for their pains. But let us, my Reverend Brethren, cling closely to those principles, and that standard of the truth, without which we may fluctuate for ever, or wade after floating corks and feathers, till the deep waters close upon us; till death shuts the curtain, and the sequel may be, to lie down empty at the last, and to lose the fruit of all our labours.

But not to close with so sad a picture, one word from our blessed Lord's lips shall plant in us a better hope, and fix a glad assurance in our hearts: "Whosoever," said our Divine Instructor, "shall drink of the water that I shall give him, it shall be unto him a well of water springing up into everlasting life."



## POSTSCRIPT.

---

I WILL here subjoin some testimonies from our own store, the good old English pastors of our Church, for with all my admiration of the zeal of many in the present day, and my fears too lest I should fall short, or lest they should exceed, I must confess that I very much admire the judgment of the past age in our Church, and have never found it yet surpassed.

Excellent are the words of Archbishop Tennison, "The Apostles were themselves without error, both "in their own assent to the fundamentals of the "Christian faith, and in the delivery of them. They "heard the oracles of Christ from his own mouth, "and they were witnesses of his resurrection, and "they spake what they had seen and heard. They "gave to the world assurance of the truth, by the "miraculous signs of their apostolic office, and if "they had not had such assistance themselves, and "could not have given proof to others of their mission, there would have been a defect in the first "promulgation of the Gospel, and such as could not



“ afterwards have been amended. That which at  
 “ first had been delivered with uncertainty, would  
 “ with greater uncertainty have been conveyed down  
 “ to after ages, and men, who, in process of time,  
 “ graft error upon truth, would much more have  
 “ grafted error upon uncertain opinion. Ever since  
 “ the Apostles’ times, there has been true faith, and  
 “ the profession of it in the Catholic Church, and it  
 “ will be so till faith shall expire, and men shall see  
 “ Him on whom they before believed. For a Church  
 “ cannot subsist without the fundamentals of Christ-  
 “ ianity; and Christ hath sealed this truth with his  
 “ promise—that there shall be a Church as long as  
 “ this world continues. I mean by a Church, a  
 “ visible society of Christians, both ministers and  
 “ people, for public worship upon earth cannot be  
 “ invisible.” In this you see is included, by this  
 wise and judicious prelate, all the provisions which  
 Christ and His Apostles made for every settled  
 Church in all lands.

Speaking of councils, as one of the pretended infal-  
 libles, having shown the deference due to them, and  
 the regard which our Church pays to them, he  
 reminds us that, “ The council of Constantinople,  
 “ under Constantine Copronymus, consisting of three  
 “ hundred and thirty-eight bishops, decreed against  
 “ the use of images in churches, yet the second  
 “ council of Nice, consisting of about three hundred  
 “ and fifty bishops, determined for it; and awhile

“after in the West, the council of Frankfort, consisting of about three hundred bishops, reversed that decree; and after that, the council of Trent did re-establish it, though the voting persons were not fifty. With such uncertain doubts of belief must they move who follow a guide in religion, without reference to a further rule.

“But here,” saith he, “there is offered to us by the guide in controversies, an objection, of which this is the sum, *that the fifth canon of the Church of England does declare that the Thirty-nine Articles were agreed upon for the avoidance of the diversities of opinion, and the establishing of consent, touching true religion. Consent touching true religion, is consent in matters of faith. Establishing of consent, relating both to laity and clergy. The third and fourth canon decree the excommunication of those who will not abjure their holding popery and Socinianism. The reformed churches in France teach the like doctrine, threatening to cut them off from the Church, who acquiesce not in the resolution of a national synod. The same course was taken with the remonstrants in the synod of Dort. Wherefore, Protestants ought not to detract from the authority of general councils, whilst they assume to themselves so great a power in particular synods.*” The Archbishop never did detract from the just authority of general councils, though he held and proved too,

that they might err. But hear his own reply, "The force of this objection," saith he, "is thus removed. Every Church hath power of admitting or excluding members, else it hath not means sufficient to its end, the order and concord of the body. Every particular church ought to believe that it does not err in its definitions, for it ought not to impose any known error upon its members. But though it believes it does not err, it does not believe it upon this reason, because God hath made it an infallible judge, but rather for this, because it hath sincerely, and with God's assistance, followed a rule which is infallible, and upon this supposition it imposeth doctrines, and includeth such as with contumacy dissent from them."

"God," saith the same writer, "hath not set up any one person in the Catholic Church, (*and the same might be said of councils, or of pope and council,*) in the quality of an unerring guide in the Christian faith. The bishops of Rome, who pretend to this prerogative, do but pretend; it is a tender point, and the pope's legates in the council of Trent were enjoined to give forth this advertisement, that the fathers upon no account whatsoever should touch it, or dispute about it. They who examine it, will soon reject it as false and useless." He adds this significant remark, "Martin the Fifth received the papal mitre from the

“council of Constance, after it had deposed Gregory the Twelfth, Benedict the Thirteenth, and John the Twenty-third.

“The guide in controversies,” saith the Archbishop, “puts the question in these terms, *whether a Protestant refusing the submission of his judgment to the authority or infallibility of the Catholic Church in her councils, can have in the several articles of necessary faith, wherein the sense of Scripture is controverted, as sure a foundation of his faith as he who submits his judgment to the foresaid authority, or also infallibility.*” “Here,” saith our advocate, “in the place of the Roman Church, the word ‘authority’ is put, and that plea for Rome is dropped, and infallibility is (also) joined together with ‘authority, and it is suggested dishonestly, concerning the reformed, that they lay aside the authority of the Catholic Church in her general councils. Authority may be owned where there is not infallibility; for infallibility is not in parents natural, or civil, yet both teach and govern us. In sum (he adds) we say with St. Austin, *that there is in councils in the Church of God, a most wholesome (though not infallible) authority.* St. Austin’s words are, *in Ecclesiâ Dei saluberrimam esse auctoritatem* <sup>1</sup>.” “By this rule,” saith this grave prelate, “the primitive fathers governed themselves, and this they

<sup>1</sup> Ep. 118.

“commended to the churches, and Clemens Alexandrinus does in terms call the consent of the Old and New Testament, the Ecclesiastical Canon, and the touchstone of true and false, ἀληθῶν καὶ ψευδῶν κριτήριον<sup>1</sup>.

“It is commonly said,” he adds, “by men of the Roman Church, but injudiciously enough, that we may as well receive the creed from them as we do the Bible. But for the Reformed Church they have received neither creed nor Bible from the Church of Rome. The first enumeration of these books they find in the Apostolical Canons, and in those of the Council of Laodicea—no western writings. They have received the Scriptures from the Universal Church of all ages and places, the copies of them having been as widely dispersed as the Christians themselves. And they received them, not from the infallibility of any particular church, but upon the validity of this sure principle, that all the Christian world, so widely dispersed, could not possibly conspire in imposing false books upon them. For particular churches, we may of all others suspect the Roman, in reference to the Scriptures. For what sincerity of dealing may we hope for from such a cabal of men as has forged decrees of Councils and Popes, and obtruded them upon the

<sup>1</sup> Strom. 7.

“ world ; apocryphal books as books canonical ;  
 “ purged out of the writings of the Fathers such  
 “ places as were contrary to their innovations ; de-  
 “ pressed the originals under an imperfect Latin  
 “ copy, and left on purpose in that copy some  
 “ places uncorrected, for the serving of turns, of  
 “ which he gives a remarkable example, as Gen. iii.  
 “ 15, against the Hebrew text, the translation of  
 “ the Seventy, and the readings of the Fathers.”

“ It is true,” saith he, “ all sects of Christians  
 “ cite the Scriptures, but that does not prove the  
 “ obscurity of those sacred writings. It rather  
 “ shows the partiality, boldness, and sophistry of  
 “ those who allege them. All laws are obscure, if  
 “ this argument has force in it ; for every man, in  
 “ his own case, has the law on his side. Men take  
 “ up their opinions and heresies from other reasons,  
 “ and then, because the name of the Scriptures is  
 “ venerable, they rake into the several books of it,  
 “ and they bend and torture places, and force them  
 “ on their side by unnatural construction.”

And this is his conclusion : “ If men would use  
 “ the Church as their ministring guide, and admit  
 “ of the Scriptures as the only rule by which all  
 “ matters of faith are to be measured, they would  
 “ agree in the proper means to the blessed end of  
 “ unity in the faith.”

In referring to the volume published on this sub-  
 ject by Dr. Wise, of Canterbury, now not easily to

be met with, but containing much valuable information, it would be endless to transcribe from his book the testimonies of the Fathers, produced on either side; but it may be well to advert to the judgment of those eminent divines of all communions, and even those of distinguished writers of the Romish church, where they could get the better of their prejudices, or were unable to disentangle the subject in their own way. I shall, therefore, make some extracts from the volume before mentioned; and more particularly since they will show the reason which led to the use of terms so frequently employed by the Fathers, upon which later writers have established a theory not intended by them. They will thus stand clear of all inconsistency, and be relieved from any such reproaches.

Dr. Wise observes, that “the excellent Melancthon tells us that the ancient Fathers, when calling the Lord’s Supper a Sacrifice, meant this, *de Gratiarum actione seu memoria sacrificii seu mortis Christi*. To which purpose St. Cyprian emphatically says, *Passio est Domini Sacrificium quod offerimus*: the sacrifice we offer is the Passion of Christ; which at once he thus explains, *quia Passionis ejus mentionem facimus*, — and therefore St. Austin plainly terms it not *Sacrificium*, but *Sacramentum memoriæ*<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Wise, Christian Eucharist, p. 20.

“ Now, hereupon,” saith he, “ we may observe that Julian very well understood the Christian mysteries while objecting against them, and answered accordingly. He knew that the Christians allow of no other true sacrifice than that of the Cross, and St. Cyril plainly owns it: and therefore, now, to confirm my opinion by the consentient authority of a learned modern, I subjoin this epiphonema, *ex hac tantorum ingeniorum contentione, tanquam ex lapidum collisione, tanta veritatis lux elicitur, ut ad causæ decisionem nihil amplius desiderari videatur. Concludit enim Cyrillus, nullum proprie dictum sacrificium, sive cruentum sive incruentum, apud Christianos celebrari, præter unicum illud crucis; alia omnia spiritualia esse et mentalia*<sup>1</sup>.

“ Agreeably to this, St. Chrysostom has it, *μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας*, as much as to say, we do not offer a real sacrifice, we make a commemoration of one. Here, says Peter Martyr, *adverbium illud (μᾶλλον) magis, nihil aliud facit, quam ut id quod prius dictum fuit, quodammodo corrigat et vocem illam Sacrificii a propria significatione ad impropriam revocet*<sup>2</sup>.

“ *Omne opus bonum*, saith St. Austin, *est verum Sacrificium ut Deo inhæreamus*. (De Civ. Dei, lib. 10. c. 6.) Which agrees with this of Valentinian

<sup>1</sup> “ Bp. Morton, in tot. doctrinal. Controvers. de Eucharist. p. 325.”

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Wise, p. 31.



“ the Jesuit, *Omnes actiones rectæ Deum propitium reddunt.* (De Miss. l. ii. c. 5.)

“ He observes that Mr. Mede subscribes to these words of a learned prelate, *apud veteres Patres (ut quod res est libere fateamur) de sacrificio corporis Christi in Eucharistia incruento frequens est mentio quæ, dici vix potest quantopere quorundam alioqui doctorum hominum ingenia exercuerit, torserit, vexaverit;*” and no wonder that it hath, seeing as Mr. Mede at once confesses, “ *What the ancient Church understood by the Christian sacrifice, and wherein the nature of it consisted, is a point the most needful to be known, yet beyond belief, obscure, intricate, and perplexed; and there is nothing in the writings of the Fathers and Antiquities of the Church, so like to stumble the reader as this.*

“ To this purpose,” Dr. Wise saith to his opposers, “ the last of your friends who appeared on this subject, though it was his express design to reflect upon the very judicious and learned Bishop of Norwich for denying that the holy Eucharist is a true and proper sacrifice, yet even he subscribes to the doctrine of Mr. Thorndike, *that the Eucharist no way bears the name of a sacrifice, but as it is the same with the sacrifice upon the cross; not the same repeated, but as it is said to be that of which it is a sacrament, the sacrifice of Christ crucified mystically*<sup>1</sup>.”

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Wise, p. 73.

He brings this testimony from Dr. Potter: "the learned Professor's words are these, *in the Christian Church there is only one proper sacrifice, which our Lord offered upon the cross, and consequently Christians cannot partake of any sacrifice in a literal and strict sense, without allowing transubstantiation*: and why the Lord's Supper was called a sacrifice, he explains in the following words:—*lest therefore the Christians should want the same pledge to assure them of the Divine favour which the Jews enjoyed, our Lord appointed the elements of bread and wine, to signify his body and blood, it being common for representatives to bear the name of those things or persons which they represent. Hence, it is manifest, that to eat the Lord's Supper, is to partake of the Sacrifice of Christ* (he does not say of a sacrifice of bread and wine), *which is there commemorated and represented* <sup>1</sup>.

"The learned Dr. John Prideaux, Professor of Divinity, afterwards Bishop of Worcester, whom you will grant to have been a good disputant if ever there was one in this nation, gives his judgment of the matter in debate as follows. Speaking of the *suffragia Patrum et Scholasticorum, etsi Eucharistiam aliquoties Hostiam et Sacrificium appellat, et Sacerdotum, Oblationum, et Altarium, frequenter meminerint; non sacrificium tamen volunt hypostaticum proprie dictum, sed vel symbolicum,*

<sup>1</sup> Potter on Ch. Gov. p. 268, 270.

“ *ratione commemorationis, representationis, et appli-*  
 “ *cationis, sacrificii illius semel in Cruce peracti; vel*  
 “ *Eucharisticum, et gratiarum actiones pro tam im-*  
 “ *menso beneficio; saltem respiciebant Eleemosynas, ex*  
 “ *quibus confecta erant symbola et collatum aliquid*  
 “ *indigentibus. Hinc incruentum et rationale dicitur*  
 “ *sacrificium apud Eusebium, exanguie ab Athanasio,*  
 “ *novum ab Epiphanio, incorporeum a Cyrillo Alex-*  
 “ *andrino, non proprie sed metaphorice, ad victimarum*  
 “ *legalium similitudinem. Retinent siquidem ut Apo-*  
 “ *stoli et Evangelistæ in novo Testamento, sic et Patres*  
 “ *veteris Testamenti vocabula, vel ut Prophetis se con-*  
 “ *formarent, quibus est usitatissimum, quod spirituali-*  
 “ *ter in Ecclesia Christi erat faciendum per ritus*  
 “ *Judaici Templi et sacerdotii exprimere; vel ut*  
 “ *ostenderent antiqua ista et jam antiquata, Typos*  
 “ *tantum fuisse et umbras eorum quæ nos possidemus.*  
 “ *Unde resolvenda sunt per adverbium (velut) vel aliud*  
 “ *ejusmodi*<sup>1</sup>. ”

“ Bishop Bull,” says this author to his opponent,  
 “ is another of your pretended partisans, yet whose  
 “ sense I defy you to pervert to this purpose. Speak-  
 “ ing of Christ as offered in the Eucharist, he says,  
 “ *however this, not hypostatically, as the Trent Fathers*  
 “ *have determined (for so he was but once offered), but*  
 “ *commemoratively only: and this commemoration is*  
 “ *made to God the Father, and is not a bare remem-*

<sup>1</sup> “ J. Prid. in Lectione 16, de Missa.”

“bering or putting ourselves in mind of him. For every sacrifice is directed to God, and the oblation therein made, whatsoever it be, hath Him for its object, and not man. In the holy Eucharist therefore we set before God, the bread and wine, as figures or images of the precious blood of Christ shed, and of his precious body (they are the very words of the Clementine Liturgy), and plead to God the merit of his Son’s sacrifice, once offered on the cross for us sinners, and in this sacrament (he does not say sacrifice) represented, beseeching Him for the sake thereof, to bestow His heavenly blessings upon us<sup>1</sup>. ‘This we may take from such a very ample treasury of learning, as the universal sense of antiquity.’

“To this purpose, a very learned foreign Professor says, *Patres antiqui et probatiores Cœnam Domini in duas partes distinctas, quarum altera sacramentum, altera sacrificium sit, non distrahunt, sed unam eamque; totam sacramenti celebrationem sacrificium et oblationem appellant*<sup>2</sup>.”

“Neither,” says the learned Dr. Fulke, “does any ancient Father speak of a sacrifice, in the form of bread and wine, although many do call the sacrament, which is celebrated in bread and wine, a sacrifice improperly, because it is a remembrance of the one only sacrifice of Christ’s death, and because the spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving is

<sup>1</sup> “ Bp. Bull in answer to the Bp. of Meaux, p. 25, 26.”

<sup>2</sup> Bal. Meisner. in *Philos. sobria*, pt. ii. p. 124.

“ offered therein, not by the minister only, but by the whole Church, that is partaker thereof.”

“ And, therefore, again,” says our learned Bishop Davenant, “ *nobis Jesus Christus est Solus et Eternus, neque successorum neque vicariorum indigus, novi Testamenti Sacerdos. Quæro enim, cui bono alii sacerdotes substituerentur ipsi Christo? Non ut sacrificium ejus adumbrent, tanquam futurum: est enim olim Deo exhibitum, non hodie exhibendum; non ut significant tanquam factum, est sacramentum celebrare, non sacrificium offerre*<sup>1</sup>.”

“ To which purpose let the learned Spalatensis put in a word: *Sicut nemo succedit Pontifici Christo in Ecclesia, quia ipsemet perseverat, ita neque quisquam vere et proprie, ut docent Augustinus et Chrysostomus, sacrificat, sed memoriam tantum representat*<sup>2</sup>.”

“ He refers to Bishop Beveridge, who observes, “ *Ecclesia Christiana Judaicæ succedente, et Episcopis, et Presbyteris, et Diaconis, in locum Pontificum, Sacerdotum, et Levitarum, substitutis; nemini mirum esse potest, quod Judaica ista nomina, apud Clementem, Tertullianum aliosque Ecclesiæ primitivæ Scriptores ad eosdem in ecclesia ordines designandos, aliquando usurpata fuerint*<sup>3</sup>.”

To the same effect, he quotes the judicious

<sup>1</sup> Davenant, in Quæss. 13. determinat. p. 62.

<sup>2</sup> “ De Rebus Eccles. l. i. p. 9.”

<sup>3</sup> “ In Cod. Can.”

Hooker: "*The Fathers of the Church, with like security of speech, call the ministry of the Gospel, priesthood, in regard to that which the Gospel hath proportionably to ancient sacrifices; namely, the commemoration of the blessed body of Christ, although it ('the Church') have properly no sacrifice*<sup>1</sup>."

He cites the learned Mason to the same effect: "*Although in this name of priest you have a relation to bodily sacrifice, yet even so are we called priests by way of allusion. For as deacons are not of the tribe of Levi, yet the ancient Fathers do commonly call them Levites, attending to their office, because they came in the place of Levites, so the ministers of the New Testament may be called sacrificers, because they succeed the sons of Aaron, and come in place of sacrificers. Fourthly, forasmuch as we have authority to minister the sacraments, and consequently the Eucharist, which is a representation of the sacrifice of Christ; therefore, we may be said to offer Christ in a mystery, and to sacrifice Him figuratively in the way of commemoration.*"

He then quotes Bellarmine: "*Dico primos Christianos propter recentem memoriam sacrificii Aaronici abstinuisse non solum a vocabulo templi sed etiam sacerdotii, ne viderentur adhuc durare Judaicæ cæremoniæ. Itaque Apostoli in suis epistolis, pro sacerdotibus episcopos et presbyteros; pro*

<sup>1</sup> Hooker, *Eccles. Pol.* l. 7. c. 78.

“ *templis ecclesias dicunt ; et similiter loquuntur Justinus, Ignatius, et alii antiquissimi patres* <sup>1</sup>.”

Estius confesses, too, “ *sacerdotis vocabulum, quo offerendi sacrificii potestas, seu functio proprie significatur, in Scriptura Novi Testamenti non legitur, Sacerdotibus novæ legis attributum, sed soli Christo.*” — “ *Quia Judæis nomine communicare noluerunt Apostoli, ne non abrogatum vetus illud sacrificium videretur* <sup>2</sup>.”

He adds afterwards Maldonatus and Jansenius making like confessions.

He brings a testimony from the learned Spanheim. “ Spanheim,” saith he, “ observes, that in “ the fourth century, *Liturgiarum ambages, officium, missaticum, introitus, graduale, offertorium, chorgium universum*, were *ignota*, utterly unknown, “ and were only additional inventions made by “ Celestinus, Gelasius, and particularly by Gregory “ the Great and his successors. Nay, he tells “ us yet further, that the Liturgy even of St. “ Chrysostom and St. Basil have been strangely “ interpolated ; that the former has been so, he “ plainly saw by comparing it with an ancient “ manuscript which he had by him, and which was “ lately brought from the East. In this (says he), “ *Desunt omnia, quæ habentur in vulgatis exemplaribus, de præparatione panis, de ratione consecrandi,*

<sup>1</sup> “ Bell. de cultu sancto, c. 4. Sect. ad Testimonia Patrum.”

<sup>2</sup> “ Estius, cited by Bp. Morton.”

*“ de materia consecrata, de compellatione Christi post consecrationem.”*

*“ Now most of the ancients,” says Bishop Cosins, called it a sacrifice, partly in imitation of the Old Testament, where words and phrases have been accommodated to the Christian rites ; partly because it is a sensible rite, supplying the place of sensible things ; partly because, when it was celebrated, more things were wont to be offered which were used in sacrifices, or at least went to the use of the ministers of the church or the poor, which in Scripture phrase were called sacrifices acceptable to God ; partly because therein thanks are given to God, and prayers poured out, which in Scripture are styled by the name of sacrifice, that is figuratively and analogically, as it is very common to call the ministries of the New Testament ; and partly because by these prayers the passion, death, and merits of Christ, are offered up to God the Father by commemoration and representation. And upon this account other names were used by the ancients, such as Hostia, Victima, Immolatio, Oblatio.”* ‘ But not once does he say that the Eucharist was called a sacrifice, because it was really a proper sacrifice of bread and wine.’

In like manner Bishop Jewel, *“ The old learned Fathers delighted themselves with these words : Sacros, altare, sacrificium, the sacrificer, the altar, the sacrifice, notwithstanding the use whereof were then clearly expired ; only for that the ears of the*



“ people, as well as of the Jews, had been long acquainted with the same<sup>1</sup>.”

“ Bishop Prideaux observes, *Quis nescivit, sacrificare, offerre, immolare, et similia apud patres, idem sonare per metaphoram, ac actiones ecclesiasticas, ad cultum Dei pertinentes, celebrare, tractare, peragere* ? ”

“ Bishop Patrick says, *not one of the Fathers have a word of a proper sacrifice, but of reasonable, unbloody, mystical, heavenly sacrifice* .”

And with the words of Bishop Cosins, I shall conclude this Postscript, “ *There is indeed a remembrance and a prayer both within and without this most holy sacrament, because the body of Christ which was delivered to death, is exhibited therein ; and besides, by symbolical and sacramental actions, the deliverance of His body and the effusions of His blood are figured out ; therefore the ancients love to call the commemoration peculiar to His sacrament, a commemorative sacrifice, and the prayer an oblation, both these words being taken not properly, but in an improper, large, or metaphorical signification.*”

<sup>1</sup> “ Under the 17th Article against Harding, fol. 410.”

<sup>2</sup> “ In lectione 16, De Missæ Sacrificio, fol. 257.”

<sup>3</sup> “ In answer to Touchstone of the Reformed Gospel, p. 221.”

THE END.

A  
C H A R G E,  
&c.

**L O N D O N :**  
**GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,**  
**ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.**

**THE DIVINE COMMISSION AND PERPETUITY OF THE  
CHRISTIAN PRIESTHOOD:**

AS CONSIDERED IN A

**C H A R G E**

TO

**THE CLERGY**

OF THE

**ARCHDEACONRY OF ST. ALBAN'S,**

**AT HIS PRIMARY VISITATION,**

**A. D. MDCCCXVI.**

---

BY THE LATE

**VEN. JOHN JAMES WATSON, D.D.**

**ARCHDEACON OF ST. ALBAN'S.**

---



"Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the  
Word of God ; whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation."

HEB. xiii. 7.

---

**LONDON:**

**PRINTED FOR J. G. F. & J. RIVINGTON,**

**ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD,**

**AND WATERLOO PLACE, FALL MALL.**

---

**1839.**



## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

THE late Archdeacon WATSON, almost precluded, for many of the latter years of his life by his infirm state of health, from the public exercise of preaching, and averse to all kinds of publicity except such as the simple discharge of duty required, had never during his life-time allowed any of his Sermons or Charges to be committed to the press. It is not in the intention of those who have the charge of his papers, to act contrary to his known wishes by offering a selection of them to public perusal now; but many, to whom he was endeared as a friend or in his pastoral relation, having desired to possess some memorial of his mind and thoughts, the following Charge, delivered on an important public occasion, and at the time received with marked approbation by the respectable body of Clergy to whom it was addressed, was chosen with a view to meet that wish by a small private impression.

On further consideration, however, it appeared so strongly to illustrate a part of the revered Archdeacon's character, (feelingly alluded to in a Funeral Sermon<sup>1</sup>, printed at the request of the Parishioners) viz. "his high sense of the dignity and of the responsibility of the Ministerial Office;"—a portion of Divine Revelation, once too little appreciated, but which he happily lived to see

<sup>1</sup> "The Good Shepherd"—a Sermon preached in the parish church of Hackney on the Sunday next following the funeral of the Ven. J. J. WATSON, D.D. Archdeacon of St. Alban's, by the Rev. H. H. NORRIS, M.A.—Page 20.

restored to its due regard with a large proportion of Churchmen;—whilst at the same time it contained such a seasonable declaration of his sentiments on certain schemes of National Education<sup>1</sup> now unhappily revived; that it has been thought more due both to the author's memory, and to the Truth, which through his useful life he devotedly maintained, to present it as a public offering for the service of the Church; in the humble hope that it may confirm some hearts that “tremble for the Ark of God<sup>2</sup>,” and instruct the zeal of others that are bold in its defence.

<sup>1</sup> See p. 22, of the following Charge.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Samuel iv. 13.

*August, 1839.*

A

## C H A R G E,

&c.

---

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,

IN submitting to the consideration of the respectable Body of Clergy connected with this Archdeaconry any suggestions upon professional subjects or pastoral duties, I cannot but very strongly feel that I am addressing many of my Brethren who require not from me either counsel or incitement "to speak the things which become sound doctrine," or "to show themselves in all things patterns of good works<sup>1</sup>." I must not however allow myself to find in that conviction an excuse for neglecting the province assigned to me on such occasions as the present, although, in endeavouring to acquit myself of this obligation, I unavoidably trespass on the attention of several, who, upon the very points in discussion, may be better qualified to give than to receive

<sup>1</sup> Tit. ii. 7.



instruction. There are indeed some truths of such acknowledged importance, and yet not always perhaps present to us in their clearest light, that any assistance offered to recall them to our recollection, from whatever hand it comes, will never be received with indifference. And though, I humbly trust, we are none of us strangers to what our sacred function demands from us, yet who is there so sufficient for these things, as to reject the word of friendly exhortation? My best security however will be from your regard to the office, to which you can have no exceptions, abstracted from the officer, liable to so many.

I would request you therefore, in your indulgent acceptance of my imperfect services, to divest yourselves of any personal consideration, and to receive me as the messenger from superior authority, acting, under a trust of deep responsibility, for the support of those ecclesiastical regulations, which are designed and calculated to promote the peace, good order, and prosperity of the Church of which we are Ministers. Commissioned for these high and honourable objects by a Prelate<sup>1</sup>, whose distinguished talents and endearing virtues conciliate the respect and attachment of all within the sphere of their influence, and have already, I doubt not, given him the strongest hold on your affection and esteem, it will be my persevering endeavour and most anxious wish to justify a con-

<sup>1</sup> His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, then Bishop of London.

fidence more valued than merited by me, and to approve myself among you as a faithful fellow-labourer with yourselves for the advancement of those important interests which we have equally at heart; anticipating, in your cordial co-operation and advice, the surest pledge of a successful prosecution of my duties, and looking for their most acceptable recompense in this world, to the regard and friendship of this venerable Body, the credit, regularity, and comfort of your respective Parishes, and the approval of our revered Diocesan.

Among the various subjects, which most naturally engage the considerations of such meetings as this, some unquestionably acquire a more immediate interest from the temper and circumstances of the times. And although those in which we live afford abundant matter of anxious examination, and are big with consequences essentially affecting both our spiritual and temporal concerns, yet I know not whether there be any which a conscientious Pastor of Christ's flock, desirous of bringing back the stray sheep to the fold, and of preventing others from wandering, will feel to be of stronger urgency, than a clear, correct, and convincing statement of the nature and constitution of the Christian Church, as necessarily involving the exclusive validity of the Episcopal Priesthood. To ourselves it must be most satisfactory to be able to establish, upon the solid basis of scriptural evidence, the sure footing on which we stand in the assumption

of the ministerial office; nor can it be of less moment to those among whom, and for whose benefit, that ministry is exercised. Since at the very time when St. Paul is most earnestly exhorting the Gentiles to call on the Name of the Lord that they may be saved, he emphatically warns them of the impossibility of their doing so, except through the ministration of those whom that Lord should graciously send for that purpose. "How," said he, "shall they call on Him in Whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him of Whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a Preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent<sup>1</sup>?" Sent then in what manner, and by Whom<sup>2</sup>? Here the whole difficulty hinges: and never was it more desirable fully to inform and satisfy the minds of those entrusted to our charge upon a point, in which they are so liable to be misled, and which so materially affects their eternal interests. Never could such an inquiry be more seasonably instituted than at a time

<sup>1</sup> Rom. x. 14, 15.

<sup>2</sup> " St. Paul speaks not only for himself and his assistants, but for all that were to succeed him in the ministry. His words do now infer as well as then, that *if there be no sending, there can be no preaching*. Either we must say that preaching, and consequently praying in the congregation and administering the Sacraments, is not God's work; or that those, who lawfully do it, have God's authority for what they do."—*Dr. Edw. Hyde, Christ and His Church.*

when there no longer exists any impediment, but a conscientious one, to the arbitrary assumption of the ministerial character in any form of man's own devising ; and when the ignorant and giddy multitude, unconscious or fearless of God's displeasure, and freed from the restraint of human laws, may again make to themselves Priests of the lowest of the people. A privilege not unsparingly exercised of late, when many who could not write their names, and some who could not read them, have claimed to be the ambassadors of that Divine Lord, Who, in the days of His earthly ministration, "glorified not Himself to be made an High Priest<sup>1</sup>," until He had received an outward and visible seal and attestation of His calling.

If then there be any real foundation for a charge which has been brought against the Clergy of the Church of England, and alleged by those whose friendly disposition towards it is as little to be doubted as their ability and means of judging, that there is no one article in our Creed less frequently enforced, and, of necessary consequence, less understood and less attended to, than that in which we profess our belief of the Holy Catholic Church ; if the amiable and excellent Bishop Horne be correct in stating to his Clergy that it is a subject on which men's principles have for some years past been very

<sup>1</sup> Heb. v. 5.

unsettled, and their knowledge precarious and superficial ; if the opinion of the most distinguished of my Predecessors<sup>1</sup>, who filled this chair with such pre-eminent advantage to the cause of sound religion, and such commanding intellect as has seen few equals in modern times, be entitled to respect, when he admonishes his Clergy to instruct their parishioners in the nature of the Church and the necessity of Church Communion, as “points of doctrine on which the people of this country in general want much good teaching :” if such high authorities must deservedly have weight with us, then shall I need no other apology with you, my respected Brethren, for wishing to direct your attention to an object of such vital importance ; persuaded as I am that it would be difficult to calculate the extent of the mischiefs, which have arisen from the low ideas maintained and propagated even by good men upon this great subject ; and satisfied from my own intercourse with the world, that they, who have never been undeceived in the prevailing delusion that the Church may be *any thing*, are soon led, by a very easy transition, to conclude it may be *nothing*.

Our Divine Lawgiver can never, therefore, be supposed to have left us in ignorance of so essential a branch of our duty. On so interesting a subject His will must have been fully known to those, with

<sup>1</sup> Bp. Horsley.

whom He was conversant for the space of forty days after His resurrection, expressly explaining to them "the things concerning His kingdom<sup>1</sup>," and to whom He gave commission to act in His name, to "make disciples of all nations," and to "teach them to observe all things whatsoever He had commanded them<sup>2</sup>."

From their teaching then—that is, from the doctrine and practice of our Lord's Apostles, illustrated by the analogy of the divinely constituted Church of Israel, and confirmed by the concurring testimony of the first and purest ages of the Gospel, and by the uniform observance of succeeding generations for more than fifteen hundred years, we may securely derive every degree of information upon this essential doctrine, which can be necessary to direct our faith or influence our conduct. To these we must refer, if we would trace to their authentic source the constitution and government of that Church, to which the promise of His divine presence and continued support was given by its blessed Founder.

We may sufficiently collect from the inspired interpreters of His will what the goodness of God has in this respect done for the children of men. With the Sacred Volume in our hands, we shall be at no loss to discover the beautiful and striking coincidence of all its parts with each other, all pointing with equal certainty and precision to the same object, and under

<sup>1</sup> Acts i. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

every dispensation representing the Church of God as one Body, actuated by one Spirit, and confirmed in one Faith and Hope. We may even trace it in all its progressive stages, from its institution in Paradise, and establishment in the line of Seth, and subsequent confinement to a single family in the Ark, to its gradual enlargement in the posterity of the faithful Abraham, its settlement in the promised land, and all that happened to it till the fulness of time was come for the manifestation of its Lord and Redeemer, Who was to put the finishing hand to the constitution of this spiritual Society, and fix it on an immoveable foundation.

Through the whole of this interesting and extended view, one striking circumstance can scarcely fail to arrest our attention; that, under every dispensation of Divine grace, some particular persons were specially set apart for performing the sacred rites of religion, and invested for that purpose with a corresponding and exclusive authority. The scriptural records, it is true, say but little on the subject of the patriarchal economy. But even in the concise account given us of that period, we perceive evident marks of the Divine institution of sacrifice as an essential part of the primeval worship; and thence, by necessary inference, of the Divine institution of the Priesthood also. And it has been thought that the right to minister in holy things was originally given to the first-born, as the type of Him Who was to be the great High Priest, and the First-Born

among many brethren ; and that on this account Esau is described by St. Paul as “a profane person<sup>1</sup>,” one who despised this distinguished privilege of his birth, and undervalued God’s appointment ; wherefore the honour of the Priesthood was transferred to his younger brother Jacob.

Pursuing our inquiry to the days of Moses (the most eminent type of Christ) we may discover in the Jewish Church a very striking exemplar of the form and ministrations of the Christian ; and we find frequent reference made to it as such in the writings of the New Testament, which seem to consider the Jewish dispensation as the infancy of the Christian, and the Christian as the matured growth of the Jewish<sup>2</sup> ; while the body in both is formed after the same model, and possesses a very striking similarity of features.

The great mystery indeed of man’s salvation forms one perfect and stupendous whole. It might justly be expected therefore that there should be an uniformity in all its parts. When the God of the Hebrews Himself condescended to regulate the service of the Jewish Church by the express appointment of those who were to administer its ordinances, it is reasonable to infer that the Same God, when manifested in the flesh for its deliverance, would adopt a similar plan in the government and ministrations of

<sup>1</sup> Heb. xii. 16.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. x. 1—4.



the Christian Church. When the Law was adorned with a Priesthood of God's own institution,—a whole tribe of Levites separated by His direction from the rest of the people, and peculiarly set apart for the service of the Tabernacle,—and that Tabernacle, with all its holy things, expressly designated as the type and figure of Christ's Body<sup>1</sup>, may we not expect to find in that Body, which is His Church, the completion of all that was thus foreshadowed in the Mosaic Economy? And as the Hebrew ministration was to be an ordinance commensurate with the continuance of their temple and nation, so in like manner the Divine Institution, Authority, and Perpetual Duration of the Christian Priesthood are conveyed to us in Scripture in those memorable words of our blessed Lord to His Apostles, “As My Father hath sent Me, so send I you; and lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world<sup>2</sup>.”

Such was the high commission of Him to Whom all power had been given in Heaven and Earth, and from Whom consequently all authority, ecclesiastical as well as civil, must be derived. Every Ministry therefore, that does not lead up to Him through His Apostles and their successors, must be considered as an unwarranted intrusion into the sacred office; an unauthorized assumption of rights assigned by Christ Himself to His appointed Messengers, when He was

<sup>1</sup> Heb. viii. 2.

<sup>2</sup> St. Matt. xxviii. 20.

thus graciously pleased to send them, even as He Himself had been sent by His Heavenly Father, with the same power to preside over and supply the wants of His Church, and to perpetuate the ministerial order in the same manner as He had begun it.

This is the only way in which it can be carried forward, consistently with the plain language of the Scriptures, and in uniformity with its original institution. For the Church being the Church of God, it can never be in the power of man to remodel it after his own devices; nor can any one convey to another an authority which he possesses not himself. "No man (saith the Apostle,) taketh this honour to himself, but He that was called of God, as was Aaron<sup>1</sup>." The rule is absolute, and the reason evident: since ministers in the Christian Church act for God to the people; which they cannot do without God's commission. While its Lord and Lawgiver continued personally present with His Apostles, that commission was of a more limited nature. But, just before their Lord's ascension, they were in a more solemn manner invested with ampler powers to supply the place of their absent Master, in the superintendence and government of His Church; and were enabled to convey to others, that Episcopal authority, which they had themselves received from the Chief Shepherd and Bishop of Souls, that thus

<sup>1</sup> Heb. v. 4.

there might be an uninterrupted succession of ecclesiastical Governors and Pastors, who, in consequence of Christ's gracious promise, might rely on the continuance of His spiritual presence and support in the discharge of their sacred functions, even unto the end of the world. "GOD," saith St. Paul, "hath set some in the Church, first Apostles<sup>1</sup>." First not only in order of time, but in dignity of office; and we accordingly find them shortly afterwards exercising this enlargement of their power, in prescribing various rites and regulations to be observed by the members of their spiritual Society, and in providing for the rapid increase of the work entrusted to them by sending more Labourers into the Vineyard. Thus we read that Paul and Barnabas, in the course of their journeyings "to confirm the souls of the disciples, ordained elders or presbyters in every Church<sup>2</sup>;" and we elsewhere find the former reminding Titus that he had left him as Bishop in Crete, that "he should set in order the things which were wanting, and ordain elders in every city<sup>3</sup>."

We further read of the Apostles ordaining another order of Church Ministers, who, from the nature of their chief employment, were denominated Deacons; being more immediately entrusted with the care of the poor, and the charitable collections made for their relief: and they had also authority, as we learn from

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. xii. 28.

<sup>2</sup> Acts xiv. 22, 23.

<sup>3</sup> Titus i. 5.

the account given of St. Philip and St. Stephen, to baptize, and to preach the Gospel.

It is to these three orders in the Ministry that St. Paul, in the passage above referred to, is generally considered as alluding when he says, "GOD hath set some in the Church—first, Apostles—secondarily, Prophets—thirdly, Teachers:" which three gradations of office, distinguishing the Christian, as they had before distinguished the Jewish dispensation, were carefully and constantly preserved in the primitive Church, and spread with the extension of the Gospel to the ends of the earth. In every corner of the converted world we find the Bishops, as the successors of the Apostles in all their ordinary ministerial powers, presiding over their several portions of the flock of Christ, exclusively administering the rite of Confirmation as the seal of admission into that flock, and ordaining Presbyters as the Pastors of its several congregations, and Deacons for the services peculiarly allotted to their order, and exercising their Episcopal authority, each in his own particular Diocese, as well as in preserving the peace, unity, and order of the whole body of Christians.

According to this plan of Church government, (to which our own so happily corresponds, and from which it is regularly derived,) we see St. Paul, in his solemn charge to Timothy, when appointed Bishop of the Church in Ephesus, putting him in mind, among other injunctions, that he should lay hands suddenly

on no man, and receive no accusation against a Presbyter but before two or three witnesses ; and that the Deacons in his Diocese should be men of sober and orderly conversation<sup>1</sup>. We have here a sufficient intimation of what then was, and what was consequently designed to be, the form of ecclesiastical administration. We find the several officers of the Church distinguished by their respective stations, the Bishop as Governor and Inspector of a particular portion of it, answering to the High Priest among the Jews ; the Presbyters and Deacons, subordinate ministers in it, corresponding to the Priests and Levites.

Thus did it please the Divine Wisdom to institute the several Orders of the Christian Priesthood after the pattern of the Jewish Church, which was of His own appointment : and in a case of so much consequence to the souls of men, God hath Himself interposed to secure us from all uncertainty, by providing that there should be no *novelty*, but a continuation of the like administration, under the Gospel, with that which had been all along known and acknowledged in His Church. We cannot therefore mistake the one, if we have an eye to the other. Such is the goodness of God in directing us, through all the confusion of the latter days, by a rule of such great antiquity, to the way of Truth,

<sup>1</sup> 1 Tim. v. 19. 22. iii. 8. 12.

and keeping us in it. And wherever we find this rule faithfully observed, wherever we recognize these three Orders of Ministers duly appointed and deriving their authority in uninterrupted transmission from the Apostles, where the pure Word of God is preached, and His Sacraments duly administered, there we acknowledge the true Church of Christ, with its form, its ministrations, its authority, and every thing essential to its nature and constitution. Such, we humbly trust, is the National Church of this country. And since in every well-ordered Society, it has ever been found necessary to its peace and preservation, that some form of religious worship and instruction should receive its particular countenance and protection, highly favoured is that kingdom where the Religion thus cherished needs not shrink from the test of Scripture, but is found correctly to accord in doctrine and discipline with the standard there delivered. Highly favoured is that kingdom, where the Education of the People is guarded by such principles as tend to unite all classes in the bond of fellowship provided by the Church of Christ; that bond which can alone secure concord among citizens or permanence to the civil state. "Happy are the people that are in such a case, yea blessed are the people who thus have the Lord for their God<sup>1</sup>."

It can never be, then, that Christian Statesmen will consent to adopt by legislative enactments any

<sup>1</sup> Psal. cxliv. 15.

and presumption. Much safer will it be for him to place himself under God's directions, to abide by His institutions, and with all humility and thankfulness to make use of those appointed instruments and means, by which the Divine Mercy hath vouchsafed to lead him in the way wherein he ought to walk,—the only way which can conduct him with certainty to present happiness and future glory.

THE END.





1

2





[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

